

## LAB'AYA'S CONNECTION WITH SHECHEM REASSESSED\*

BY

MURRAY R. ADAMTHWAITE

One of the many vexed problems in the interpretation of the Amarna correspondence concerns the placement of the various Canaanite kinglets in their respective capitals and spheres of operation. While for some kinglets the evidence is clear, for example, Milkilim at Gezer, Yašdata in Ta'anach, or Zimreda at Lachish, for other kinglets the task is not so easy, notably Šuwardata who has been placed variously at Hebron, Gath, or Qilti. Another latent problem is the location of the notorious Lab'aya, almost universally identified with Shechem, but the evidence for this comes from a single and difficult reference in EA 289:20-24. This identification is here challenged with an alternative capital proposed at Pella in the Transjordan. In turn, this relocation carries implications for understanding aspects of Egyptian control in the region at this time.

According to the accepted wisdom Lab'aya ruled from Shechem, and from there controlled the hill country of central Palestine, with extensions further afield depending on which author one reads. Thus for Albright he ruled "from the Mediterranean to the hills of Gilead, from the plain of Esdraelon to the frontiers of Jerusalem".<sup>1</sup> Aharoni

\* In addition to other abbreviations indicated in subsequent notes the following are used in this article: ANET: J.B. Pritchard (ed.), *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*, 3rd ed. with Suppl., Princeton, 1969; AT: D.J. Wiseman, *The Alalab Tablets*, London, 1953; BA: *The Biblical Archaeologist*; BASOR: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*; CAD: *The Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*; CAH: *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 3rd ed., 1973; *Chronology*: E.F. Campbell, Jr., *The Chronology of the Amarna Letters*, Baltimore, 1964; IEJ: *Israel Exploration Journal*; JNES: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*; Knudtzon: J.A. Knudtzon, *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*, Band I, Leipzig, 1915. (Knudtzon's numbering is herein followed throughout); LB: Y. Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, 2nd ed., London, 1979; MBA: Y. Aharoni and M. Avi-Yonah, *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*, rev. ed., New York — London, 1977; MLEA; W.L. Moran, *Les Lettres d'El-Amarna*, Paris, 1987 (French); RA: *Revue d'Assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*; SAA: E.F. Campbell, "Shechem in the Amarna Archive", Appendix 2 in G.E. Wright, *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City*, London, 1965.

<sup>1</sup> W.F. Albright, "The Amarna Letters from Palestine", in CAH, II.2, p. 116.

sees a similar extent: the Jezreel Valley, Mt. Ephraim, and encroaching to Jerusalem, with Gezer and the Sharon Plain to the west, all radiating from Shechem according to his map.<sup>2</sup> He comments elsewhere in this connection that (his) territory "was especially large in contrast to the small Canaanite principalities round about".<sup>3</sup> Rainey likewise sees him as an empire builder. For him Lab'aya aimed to extend his hegemony from the central hill country in Mount Shechem down to the Sharon plain and the Jezreel Valley on the north, particularly for control of the trade routes, e.g. through the Dothan Valley. These activities brought on Egypt's attention, who issued a warrant for his arrest.<sup>4</sup> Campbell credits him with a similar territorial hold<sup>5</sup>, as does Ross.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, the latter sees Lab'aya as aiming at an empire encompassing the whole of Palestine with Shechem as its capital.<sup>7</sup> Significantly, only Albright credits him with any kind of control of the Transjordan, as seen in the reference to "the hills of Gilead" in the above quotation. Albright's extension of hegemony is not based on Lab'aya's recorded activities but appears to derive from a theory of contemporaneous rule by Mut-Ba'lu in turn to explain the latter's connection with Pella as evidenced in letter 256.<sup>8</sup> However, Campbell hints at a proxy control in the Trans-Jordan, through his son possibly following Albright.<sup>9</sup>

Thus the general consensus is that while Lab'aya lived, there was a "Lab'ayan empire" west of Jordan, based in Shechem, but as to the extent of this alleged empire the consensus there ends and confusion begins. Possibly it included Pella in the Transjordan where Lab'aya installed his son, though on these points there is no general consensus: while Albright and Campbell hint at such an extent as noted, others either note the shift to the Trans-Jordan with little comment

<sup>2</sup> MBA, p. 36 and map 40.

<sup>3</sup> LB, p. 175

<sup>4</sup> A. F. Rainey, "Gath-Padalla", *IEJ*, 18 (1968), pp. 7-9.

<sup>5</sup> E. F. Campbell, Jr., "The Amarna Letters and the Amarna Period", *BA*, 23 (1960), p. 19.

<sup>6</sup> J. F. Ross, "Gezer in the Tell el-Amarna Letters", *BA*, 30 (1967), p. 66. For both Ross, and Campbell (*art. cit.* #[n. 5], p. 19) Lab'aya aimed at control of the Jezreel Valley without actually achieving it. Aharoni concurs, LB, p. 175.

<sup>7</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>8</sup> CAH, p. 116: "A son of his (?), Mut-Ba'al, became chief of Pella ...", presumably, according to Albright, while his father still lived, though this is not clear.

<sup>9</sup> SAA, p. 206. However, the same author in his *Chronology*, p. 97, observes that such a contemporaneous construction involves a difficulty with Mut-Ba'lu being able to write diplomatic correspondence in his own right.

or ignore it altogether.<sup>10</sup> Astonishingly, several authors assert that Lab'aya's sons succeeded their father at Shechem<sup>11</sup>, in clear disregard of the evidence of EA 255 and 256<sup>12</sup>, where in 255:15 Mut-Ba'lu refers to [*La-ab*]-*a-ia* ("Lab'aya") as *a-bi-šu* ("his father"), the restoration of the first two signs as [*La-ab*] being "virtually certain" according to Albright.<sup>13</sup> Then in EA 256 he is clearly king of *Pi-bi-li*: "Pella" (lines 8, 13).

To continue the conventional exposition, after Lab'aya's death Mut-Ba'lu and the other unnamed son campaigned in Palestine, often in alliance with other kinglets, e.g. Milkilim, to "regain" that lost empire, the former son operating from Pella.<sup>14</sup> As to how and under what circumstances Mut-Ba'lu moved east and became king of Pella, whether by conquest or some kind of treaty, none of the authors cited is at all specific.

These "stories" regarding the continuity from father to son raise a series of questions. We could, for instance, ask how this came about, and why at Pella, far from Shechem? What happened to the Shechem empire that it had to be "regained"? Were the sons of Lab'aya so weak in their grasp or so slow on the uptake that they either lost their grip very quickly, or were they actually ousted? This seems contrary to all the evidence of the later letters: they appear on the scene very quickly after their father's death, and appear every bit as rapacious and successful as their father was. Again, why did not one of the sons succeed to Shechem according to normal dynastic custom, as Albright observes happened elsewhere in Amarna Palestine?<sup>15</sup> Also, if one son did succeed to Shechem (despite the lack of

<sup>10</sup> Eg. Ross, *art. cit.* #(n. 6), p. 67, and Rainey, *art. cit.* #(n. 4), p. 8.

<sup>11</sup> Thus H. Reviv, "The Government of Shechem in the El-Amarna Period and in the days of Abimelech", *IEJ*, 16 (1966), p. 253. See also W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1971, p. 428: "Sichem, die Residenz des Mut-Ba'lu."! Likewise W. Harrelson, "Shechem in Extra-Biblical References", in E.F. Campbell Jr., and D.N. Freedman (eds), *The Biblical Archaeologist Reader*, Vol. II, New York, Doubleday, 1964, p. 263, is more cautious, but clearly entertaining the idea.

<sup>12</sup> See in the recent edition of the Amarna texts by W.L. Moran, *MLEA*, pp. 482-5. For the full transcription and commentary on EA 256 see W.F. Albright, "Two Little Understood Amarna Letters from the Middle Jordan Valley", *BASOR*, 89 (1943), pp. 7-17.

<sup>13</sup> Albright, *CAH*, p. 116, n. 1. Campbell, *Chronology*, p. 97, accepts this conclusion as established "without much doubt". Rainey likewise gives endorsement, *art. cit.* #(n. 4), p. 8.

<sup>14</sup> Rainey, *art. cit.* #(n. 4), p. 8.

<sup>15</sup> *CAH*, p. 101. See *infra*, p. 15f, for fuller discussion of this point.





### Translation issues

Four issues arise here, the first three being syntactical, and the last geographical. These in turn are all important to an historical reconstruction:

- (i) The sense which *enūma* should have in order for lines 21-2 to be a complete sentence.
- (ii) The status of *ū lu* and *ū* in lines 21, 23 respectively.
- (iii) Following from this, is Lab'aya in any way the subject of *idinnu* in a relative clause, or does he belong with the statement in line 21, with *ū* beginning a new sentence?
- (iv) Does *KUR Ša-AG-mi* denote the Biblical Shechem? Or is it an unknown region, as the above translation indicates ("the land of *Ša-AG-mi*")? Perhaps it is not even a proper name? We should bear in mind, as observed above, that this reference is unique and thus avoid the pitfalls of circular argument. These issues are now dealt with respectively.

#### 1. Syntax

Firstly, here the "extraordinary meaning" of *enūma* as proposed by Moran<sup>19</sup>, i.e. "like", makes excellent sense, whereby in Abdiheba's version of the scheming of Milkilim and Tagi, the latter use Lab'aya's reputation for banditry as a model for their own activities. This would be a general reference, of course. The cession of territory to the Hapiru would be simply a treacherous act in similar vein.<sup>20</sup> Meanwhile, the insertion in line 21 of an understood '(they say)' to indicate reportage maintains the sense of the somewhat disjointed structure of the preceding lines. The reported activities of Milkilim and Tagi, and Abdiheba's complaining tone in contrast then appear coherent.

The next issue (ii) concerns the rendering of these lines (22-3) as a relative clause, thus making Lab'aya the subject of *idinnu*, which has been the principal prop of the connection of Lab'aya with Shechem. However, *enūma* <sup>1</sup>*Labaya ū KUR Ša-AG-mi idinnu ana* <sup>LU.MEŠ</sup>*Habiri*<sup>KI</sup> as

<sup>19</sup> W. L. Moran, "The Syrian Scribe of the Jerusalem Amarna Letters", in H. Goedicke and J. J. M. Roberts, *Unity and Diversity: Essays in the History, Literature, and Religion of the Ancient Near East*, Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 1975, p. 166, n. 74: "This meaning probably developed from the lexical overlap of *kima* and *enūma* ..."

<sup>20</sup> E.g. Campbell: "Abdi-Heba ... asks rhetorically whether the king would have his vassal do as Lab'ayu has done, 'who gave Shechem to the 'Apiru'", *art. cit.* # (n. 5), p. 19.

a single idea makes no real sense. The various attempts of scholars to render it thus illustrate the difficulties here. We may cite Knudtzon: "nachdem Labaja und das Land Šakmi (alles) gegeben haben den Habiru"<sup>21</sup>; Albright ("....Labaya who gave the land of Shechem to the 'Apiru?"<sup>22</sup>); Campbell<sup>23</sup> (as Albright); and Dietrich: "Denn Labaja wird auch das Land Schakmi den Hapiru-Leuten ausliefern!"<sup>24</sup>; and finally Moran: "Devons-nous agir comme Lab'ayu lorsqu'il a donné le pays de Šakmu aux Hapiru?"<sup>25</sup>. All these fail to agree with each other, and take liberties either with the text or the general picture. Moreover, Dietrich's translation with a future ("wird .... ausliefern") is impossible as Lab'aya is dead by this time, and his sons are active in his place (line.6).<sup>26</sup>

Moreover, this construction of line 23 as a relative clause is highly unusual, to say the least. The relative *ša* (cf. line 9) would normally and properly serve such a purpose. Such a construction bypasses the normal consecutive use of *ù*, which normally either (i) introduces a new thought, as rendered elsewhere in this letter (e.g. line 14: *ù inanna*; line 19: *ù amēlūt*; or line 29 which introduces the specific intent of the scheme reported in 21 — 22, i.e. an assault on Jerusalem), thus rendered conjunctively by "and", or consequentially, "so", or else not at all. Alternatively (ii), as a conjunction *ù* links two entities or thoughts, and translated simply by "and".

The rendering here retains that normal conjunctive use of *ù* as introducing a new thought. As it stands *ù<sup>KUR</sup>ša-AG-mi idinnu* does read better as such, additional to *enūma Labaya* with its ellipsis of *epēšu*. Consequently this construction proposes that *ù* in line 23 is **not** a conjunction joining Labaya and Šakmi (as with Knudtzon), but two distinct ideas, the latter an act in consequence of the preceding intention, and committed not by Lab'aya in the past, but as part of

<sup>21</sup> Knudtzon, EA 289 *in loc.* J. Garstang follows Knudtzon, see his *Joshua-Judges*, originally publ. London, Constable, 1931; reprinted by Grand Rapids, Kregel, 1978, p. 255.

<sup>22</sup> As in ANET p. 489. In CAH, p. 116 Albright is slightly different, which he admits (n. 3): "like Lab'aya <and his sons> who have given the land of Shechem to the 'Apiru men." He is, like Knudtzon, trying to accommodate the plural form *idinnu*. See further *infra*, p. 5f.

<sup>23</sup> SAA, p. 200.

<sup>24</sup> M. Dietrich et al., *Rechts- und Wirtschaftsurkunden. Historisch-chronologische Texte*, Gütersloh, Gerd Mohn, 1985, p. 515.

<sup>25</sup> MLEA, p. 518.

<sup>26</sup> See the argument on this point in Campbell, *Chronology*, p. 109, and chart, p. 134; also in his SAA, pp. 201-2.

their strategy by Milkilim and Tagi in the more immediate circumstances .

As to the next issue (iii), and following the latter point, the verb *idinnu* is a plural and thus should have a plural subject. In context, it is far better to predicate *idinnu* of Milkilim and Tagi, the targets of Abdihepa's complaints, which means that Šakmi (wherever it was) has been theirs to dispose of and belonged neither to Lab'aya nor to his sons, unless of course the latter are involved with Milkilim and Tagi in this action.<sup>27</sup> A corollary point here concerns the morphology of *idinnu* (cf. 287:15): the doubled (*n*) is an orthographical variant likely due to North Syrian influence, cf. *iddinnu* (EA 155: 38; 171: 9); and *idinnunim* (161: 22), all of which are probably Amurru.<sup>28</sup> In the identical form in 287: 15 both Knudtzon and Albright treat it as a G pret. 3rd ps. pl., and likewise here it should have the same plural parsing. This reinforces the conclusion that Milkilim and Tagi are the compound subject of this verb, not the singular Lab'aya, less still Lab'aya and the land of Šakmi(!) (Knudtzon), or still more conjecturally, Lab'aya and his sons (Albright<sup>29</sup>). These latter attempts wrestle with the problem of the plural verb without solving it at all satisfactorily.

In summary, the traditional rendering is implausible anyway. Why should either Lab'aya or his sons give up any of the territory of their capital city to the Hapiru, when the former sought to build an empire based on the central hill country<sup>30</sup>, an empire which his sons, who followed in his mould would in no way want to throw away?

Thus what we have in this passage is Milkilim (as reported) exhorting his allies to behave as Lab'aya did when he was alive, presumably in bold and daring pursuit of advantage, in defiance of Egyptian policy.

One final issue arising here concerns the alleged status of Shechem as a result of Lab'aya's presumed deal . From his capital at Shechem, he is often seen as having given associated territory to them. On Campbell's suggested model, whereby "cities rebel and 'become' 'Apiru'"<sup>31</sup>, Shechem and its territory are even seen as "becoming Habiru" by their rebellion and Lab'aya a Habiru chief by his

<sup>27</sup> Even so, their involvement would be incidental and subsidiary, and thus does not affect the point here.

<sup>28</sup> So Moran, *Syrian Scribe*, art. cit. #(n. 19), p. 151.

<sup>29</sup> See *supra*, n. 22.

<sup>30</sup> Rainey, art. cit. #(n. 4), pp. 7-8.

<sup>31</sup> Campbell, e.g. in art. cit. #(n. 5), p. 15.

banditry.<sup>32</sup> This view depends in part on the understanding of *nepūšu ana* as “become”, admittedly a construction unique to Amarna.<sup>33</sup> While Liverani does indeed argue for the correctness of *nepūšu ana* in this connection as taking that meaning<sup>34</sup> by comparison with and in relation to the Egyptian *irw.m*<sup>35</sup>, this does not really affect the point. Apart from the fact that *nepūšu ana* is not used in this passage, there is no evidence here or elsewhere that Shechem is considered “Habiru” as a result of the transaction here reported. Campbell’s picture is, quite simply, conjectural. This is the case whatever the validity or otherwise of *nepūšu ana Habiri* taking the meaning “to become Habiru”, and of the whole sociological theory generally which is built (in part) on that meaning.

### Is the *KURŠa-AG-mi* = Shechem equation secure?

Turning now to the geographical issue the *Ša-AG-mi* reference is commonly assumed to be the Biblical Shechem (mod. Nablus) but there are some problems:

1. If *Ša-AG-mi* is the name of a city its occurrence with the determinative *KUR* rather than *URU* must be explained. A survey of the place names in the Abdiheba correspondence (coming from its North Syrian scribe, as Moran has argued) reveals a consistent and respective use of these signs as follows:

The cities of Qilti, Gazri, Lakisi, Ayaluna, Gintikirmil, Zilu, Rubutu, Hazati are mentioned either with *URU* to denote the city proper, or with *KUR.URU* to denote the city and the surrounding region. The one exception to this is *KURÚ-ru-sa-lim<sup>ki</sup>* in 287: 61. We should note here Moran’s observation that the combination of *KUR.URU* (six times in the Jerusalem corpus) is typically Hittite and North Syrian, occurring only twice elsewhere in the whole Amarna corpus, but frequently in Boghazköy and Ugaritic texts.<sup>36</sup> There the

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, p. 19. See also Albright, CAH, p. 114f., where his discussion follows his individualistic interpretation of the singular *LÚ.SA.GAZ* in EA 366:12,21, and identification in turn with Lab’aya, followed by his suggestion (followed also by Campbell) in *art. cit.* # (n. 12), pp. 15-17, that the sons of Lab’aya were also Habiru chiefs.

<sup>33</sup> A meaning enshrined in CAD, entry *epēšu*, 6b.

<sup>34</sup> M. Liverani, “Farsi Habiru”, *Vicino Oriente*, 2 (1979), pp. 65-77. Note the approving reference to Campbell (*art. cit.* # [n.5]) on pp. 70-1 and n. 18.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 71ff.

<sup>36</sup> Moran, *art. cit.* # (n. 19), p. 151. To reinforce this point, note also *KUR.URU Kar-ga-mis* in the recently published Emar texts. See D.Arnaud, *Recherches au Pays*

combination appears to have the meaning "city-state of X", while *KUR* plus a city name is "the land/region associated with city X" where the city gives its name to that region (by metonymy).<sup>37</sup> Even more notably, the combination *KUR.URU A-mur-ri* in RŠ 1957.1 denotes the capital of Amurru, yet there was no city as such by that name. The capital, argues Stieglitz, was Šumur.<sup>38</sup> This parallel lends support to the suggestion that Šakmi should not necessarily be seen as a city name. Equally, in Amarna correspondence names of regions or countries consistently occur with *KUR*, thus: *KUR Ka-si/šī* (287: 72, 74) = Nubia; *KUR Na-ab-ri-ma<sup>ki</sup>* (288: 35) = Nahrin of Egyptian records; *KUR.HÁŠe-e-ri<sup>ki</sup>* (288: 26) = Se'ir of Edom according to Albright.<sup>39</sup>

Jerusalem occurs either with *URU* or *KUR.URU*, the only exception being that noted above, which may well be simply either a scribal error (cf. *KUR.HÁ.URU Ū-ru-sa-lim<sup>ki</sup>* two lines later), or else denotes the countryside comprising the "Jerusalem" city-state. The omission of a determinative in the cases of *Ki-il-ti<sup>ki</sup>* (289: 28) and *bit-sa-a-ni* (289: 20) is curious, but likely due to scribal oversight.

Thus on this consistent pattern *KUR Ša-AG-mi* is pre-eminently the name of a **region** and not a city, at best the region associated with a city, and hence only possibly related to Shechem. This much is usually noted by the commentators, but the explanations vary. Harrelson, for example, asserts, "The 'land of Shechem' must be taken to refer to the city and the adjacent territory under its control".<sup>40</sup> While there is some truth in this, the general consistency of *KUR* and *KUR.URU* in this correspondence tells against a specific and necessary reference to the city. Reviv<sup>41</sup> refers the "two cities" captured from Lab'aya (EA252: 22) to the territory on the

*d'Astata: Emar VI*, Tome 3, Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, Paris, 1986, nos. 194: 16-17 and 201: 9, 16, 20, 23, 35. *KUR Kar-ga-mis* occurs in 18:1 and 202:1-3. However, the occurrence of this latter form in 201: 23 highlights its anomalous nature.

<sup>37</sup> R. Stieglitz, "The City of Amurru", *JNES*, 50 (1991), p. 45.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48. Note the parallels, wherein Alalah is called the City of Mukish (*URU Mu-ki-iš*), and Jerusalem the City of Judah (!) in 2 Chron. 25:28. The account of "2 sheep debited against *URU Mu-ki-iš<sup>ki</sup>*" in AT 352: 1 would appear to refer to Alalah itself. Cf. the tribute from (?) *māt Mu-ki-iš-šu* in AT 395: 4. M. Astour accepts these as indeed referring to Alalah: "Tel Mardih and Ebla", *UF*, 3 (1971), p. 13, n. 30.

<sup>39</sup> As in translations in ANET, pp. 488-9 *in loc.*

<sup>40</sup> W. Harrelson, *art. cit.* # (n. 11), p. 261.

<sup>41</sup> Reviv, *art. cit.* # (n. 11), p. 253.

periphery of Shechem, but this is begging the question. Campbell indeed speaks in regional terms, pointing to the determinative as one "used with names of countries"<sup>42</sup>, but still focusses strongly on the city. On the supposition that the city is referred to, one could possibly argue for scribal error here too but at most the conclusion should be tentative, not the confident equation that is so customary.

But now if a region is intended, then to what extent? Here the Egyptian references may be of some help, viz. the Middle-Kingdom Execration texts, referring to "the prince of *Skmimi*, 'bshddw", and more particularly the reference to "the foreign country of which the name was *Skmm*" in the Khu-Sebek inscription.<sup>43</sup> Both Wilson,<sup>44</sup> and Harrelson<sup>45</sup> refer the *Skmm* of this text to the Syria-Palestine region generally, albeit (for them) the central section. This is argued from the "foreign country" determinative.

By parallel reasoning <sup>KUR</sup>Ša-AG-mi should be seen in this same generalized sense, in keeping with the observation that Milkilim and Tagi are those who ceded some of this territory to the Hapiru, i.e. that portion which was theirs to give.

2. Shechem, or Hebrew Š<sup>i</sup>kém, with the accented final syllable, would more likely be reflected in Akkadian orthography as šikāmu or šakāmu or possibly šakīmu, with an accented long vowel in its second syllable. However, the elimination of the second vowel with a consequent shift of accent to the first syllable as in the normally transliterated šakmi, rather than shortening and de-accenting of the first, is odd. To illustrate this point, cf. Ga-aḫ-ri (287: 14; 290: 8) and Hebrew גִּיּוֹר; La-ki-si (287:15; 288:43) and Hebrew לָכִישׁ; Ki-il-ti (289:28, 290:10) and Hebrew קִיעִילָה<sup>46</sup>; i.e. the accent and the corresponding vowel is maintained. To turn the observation around, if Ša-AG-mi were to denote Shechem we would expect a corresponding Hebrew שֶׁכֶּמָה, or similar vocalization. Since this is not the case either way we have at least circumstantial evidence that Ša-AG-mi is not Shechem.

Though this point should be qualified somewhat by the possible Egyptian references to Shechem, as cited above, nevertheless the

<sup>42</sup> Campbell, *art. cit.* # (n. 5), p. 19.

<sup>43</sup> As translated by J.A. Wilson in ANET pp. 329, n. 8, and 230 respectively.

<sup>44</sup> ANET, p. 230, notes 7, 9.

<sup>45</sup> See the discussion in Harrelson, *art. cit.* # (n. 40), pp. 258-26.

<sup>46</sup> Admittedly, there are problems in this last equation. Cf. A.F. Rainey, *El-Amarna Tablets 359-379*, AOAT 8, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1970, Glossary, p. 92, entry "Qilti". However, compare also Šunāma (250:43) and Hebrew שׁוֹנָם, wherein the accent corresponds in the Akkadian.

uncertainties of vocalization and interpretation there cannot overthrow this point. It may at best weaken it somewhat.<sup>47</sup>

### Is KURŠa-AG-mi a Proper Name?

Though the sign KUR read as a determinative would indicate Ša-AG-mi as a proper name, which admittedly is quite possible, yet the expression could also be read as *mat ša-aq-mi*, where *māt* has a full substantival meaning, and *ša-aq-mi* is a common noun equivalent to Hebrew, שָׁקֵמָה “sycamore”, thus “land of the sycamore”. In turn this could be constructed as a reference to the Shephelah, וְאֵת הָאֲרָזִים נָתַן כְּשִׁקְמִים אֲשֶׁר-בְּשִׁפְלָה לָרֶב (cf. 1 Kings 10: 27), which indicates that this region was from early pre-Solomonic times renowned for its sycamores. According to Zohary, the sycamore thrives in the lower coastal plain, which in his view is native to the area as opposed to having been imported, e.g. from Africa.<sup>48</sup> Since this territory is precisely in the region of Gezer, Milkilim’s capital, and since on the retranslation of lines 21 — 24 he and Tagi are responsible for cession of territory to the Hapiru, could we not see here a reference to a possible deal between Milkilim and the Hapiru mercenaries for a portion of his own territory in exchange for assistance in an assault on Jerusalem, at least in Abdiheba’s view of matters? Note also here that Tagi’s territory on the Sharon plain, with his capital at Gath-Carmel (lines 18-19), adjoins this region.<sup>49</sup> This alternative reading is not here proposed as definite, but rather plausible.

However, another factor which could bolster this plausibility is Rowton’s observation that Habiru activity co-incides with forested areas, a mixture of oak, terebinth and undergrowth called *maquis*, where city states had nominal but little real control.<sup>50</sup> According to

<sup>47</sup> In summary, the vocalization can be *Škmimi* (Posener, as cited by Harrelson, *art. cit.* #[n. 11], p. 258 and n. 5), *Sakmami* (Albright, *BASOR*, 81 [1941], pp. 18-19 and n. 11), or in the Khu-Sebek text, *Sekmem* (Harrelson, *art. cit.* #[n. 11]), p. 259). As to the reference, while Albright and Harrelson equate the mention in the Execration text with Shechem, Posener (as cited by Harrelson, *art. cit.*) and Wilson (in ANET) are more non-committal. Wilson also sees the Khu-Sebek reference as to the Syria-Palestine region in general, from the “foreign country” determinative.

<sup>48</sup> M. Zohary, *Plants of the Bible*, Cambridge, 1982, p. 68.

<sup>49</sup> See map in W. Helck, *op. cit.* #[n. 11], p. 188.

<sup>50</sup> M. B. Rowton, “The Topological Factor in the Hapiru Problem”, in H.G. Güterbock and T. Jacobsen (eds), *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger*, Chicago, 1965, pp. 375-387.

Zohary the sycamore, along with the facultative “evergreens” and the true evergreens, trees and shrubs of up to 4m height, together form this Mediterranean woodland or *maquis*.<sup>51</sup> The sycamore may not normally have been the dominant constituent, but this would depend on the area in question.

Thus to follow this line from Rowton’s thesis, Milkilim, on the scenario proposed here, formally cedes to the Habiru a portion of woodland territory, already the scene of much Habiru activity and beyond his real control. Milkilim’s reasoning would have been that a trade-off here would improve his position: better to have the Habiru as allies to help further his own plans than to leave them uncontrolled and risk disruption.

Hence in all, there are good reasons for challenging the usual equation of *KURŠa-AG-mi* with Shechem, and even if the equation is accepted, the connection of Lab’aya to Shechem as its ruler on the basis of this difficult line does not necessarily follow. Alternatively, if *KURŠa-AG-mi* is a reference to the general Palestine region or a large part thereof (cf. *Škmm* in the Khu-Sebek inscription)<sup>52</sup>, then a specific reference to Shechem or its immediate surroundings is likewise rendered unlikely.

### Lab’aya Relocated to Pehel (Pella)

In order to find a plausible new location for Lab’aya elsewhere than at Shechem, the best procedure is to work from the known, or at least the reasonably certain, to the unknown and thence establish a reasonable conclusion. Fortunately, the available evidence permits this procedure. In order to examine Lab’aya himself it will be necessary first to form a picture regarding the activities of his sons, thence to draw some conclusions regarding the father.

First of all, however, a preliminary observation: that Lab’aya is a kinglet in the same manner as the others at various locations, known and unknown, is evident from the fact that he pays tribute, or at least is due for it.<sup>53</sup> Also, his own correspondence to the Pharaoh is in the usual diplomatic mould with its stereotyped introductory formulae and pleas of loyalty as a vassal.<sup>54</sup> Thus he cannot be regarded as a

<sup>51</sup> M. Zohary, *Plant Life of Palestine*, New York, Ronald Press, 1962, pp. 25 — 6, 83.

<sup>52</sup> See *supra*, n. 45.

<sup>53</sup> EA 254: 12-13, 25-6.

<sup>54</sup> EA 252-254 incl.



bandit leader or some kind of outlaw, for all his possible association with the Habiru.

(a) **Sphere of Operation.** From the evidence of geography and site identification the sphere of operation of both Lab'aya's sons and the father before them is clearly as follows: the Jezreel Valley (Beth-She'an, Megiddo, Gath-Rimmon, and probably Ta'anach<sup>55</sup>), the northern Sharon (Gath-Padalla<sup>56</sup>), and the towns in the Dothan Pass (Burquna, 'Arrabu, Gina<sup>57</sup>). No southern towns are involved, Gath-Rimmon notwithstanding, as, following Rainey, that should be regarded likewise as in the region of Ta'anach.<sup>58</sup>

As observed above, from letters 255 and 256 Mut-Ba'lu is almost certainly one of the sons, and his capital is clearly Pehel or Pella in the Transjordan. However, not only Mut-Ba'lu but both sons should be located at Pella. This may be deduced from Ba'lu-mehir's appeal to the Pharaoh to send one of his commissioners to Biryawaza with a demand to mount an attack against the two rascal sons, on pain of being branded a traitor! (250: 23-27). Biryawaza, the powerful king of Damascus, respected by Egypt above most others in the region, and also by both Rib-Adda of Byblos and Zatatna of Acco for his prowess, could exercise considerable influence from his domain in southern Syria, to the Golan and down to Bashan and perhaps even to Galilee.<sup>59</sup> If both sons of Lab'aya had their power base in the Transjordan, it would be quite natural for Ba'lu-mehir to appeal for help from the king whose power and influence was in the same region, that he inflict a powerful strike against the home stronghold of these two rascals, and thus eliminate both of them at the root. This seemingly strange request is actually an important piece of left-handed evidence for the main provenance of both.

(b) **Intentions and Goals.** These strategically located towns which they seek to control are either on or near the major trade routes. From a capital at Pella they would have been ideally located to

<sup>55</sup> EA 289: 19-20; 244:10-14; 250:40-46; 248: 18-22 respectively. The identifications of Rainey, *art. cit.* # (n. 4), p. 7 and notes 34-37 inclusive are here followed.

<sup>56</sup> EA 250: 11-14.

<sup>57</sup> EA 250: 40-46; 15-22 respectively.

<sup>58</sup> In the case of Gath-Rimmon, a second, northern town of this name (the modern Rummaneh) is indicated in Joshua 21: 25. The lack of mention in the parallel of 1 Chronicles 6: 70 (Hebrew 6: 55) is not decisive. Rainey observes (correctly, I believe) that it is unlikely that Lab'aya would have seized a city so close to Yafo and Gezer (Milkilim's territory) as the Tel Jerisheh (Gerisa) which Aharoni identifies with Gath-Rimmon.

<sup>59</sup> SAA, p. 205.

conduct forays into the Jezreel valley and the major passes on the Via Maris to the west<sup>60</sup>, and on the eastern side to control the King's Highway. From Mut-Ba'lu's injured tone in letter 255 it is a fair inference that he was interfering with traffic in that quarter. The only worry here would have been the powerful and respected Biryawaza to the north-east, and it is precisely from that quarter that Ba'lu-mehir of Gath-Padalla seeks for pressure to be brought. Equally, however, opposing kings who maintained their loyalty to Egypt constituted a threat. Ba'lu-mehir was one such, likewise Abdi-heba of Jerusalem. Alliances such as with Milkilim and Tagi were desirable to "neutralize" any such threat to their grand designs. Thus the sons of Lab'aya at Pella in the north-east are in close touch with Milkilim at Gezer in the south-west through the latter's *mār šipri* (250: 53-55). Hence the sons of Lab'aya, from this vantage point, should be seen as controlling the Transjordan and pushing west and southwest, ultimately to Gezer, rather than in the central hill-country pushing north. Similar reasoning applies to Lab'aya himself, as seen from his own northern sphere of operation. In this context belongs his celebrated, but often misunderstood, visit to Gezer, most likely to confirm an alliance with Milkilim<sup>61</sup>, one which served well both him and his sons in the ensuing years.<sup>62</sup>

(c) **Nature of Their Activity.** Should we see in them any kind of "expansionism" in the territorial-imperialistic sense? It is difficult to say. However, as with other kinglets such as Tagi at Gath-Carmel and Milkilim of Gezer the sons of Lab'aya are as much out for their own ends as others, and with the interplay of alliances they all exert pressure against client-kings such as Biridiya and Ba'lu-mehir. A more likely possibility is that we should see these forays more as razzias and intimidation with a view to changing the loyalties of the

<sup>60</sup> According to the conventional route the Via Maris passed from Damascus through the Golan, across the Jordan below the Sea of Galilee, and through the Megiddo Pass to the Sharon Plain and thence to Egypt. That the Via Maris denotes this path is called into question, at least for the early centuries A.D., by B.J. Beitzel, "The *Via Maris* in Literary and Cartographic Sources", *BA*, 54 (1991), pp. 64-75. Be that as it may, the conventional designation is adopted here for the sake of convenience.

<sup>61</sup> EA 253: 23-5; 254: 21-27. A resultant alliance appears to be reported in Addu-mehir's complaint in the fragmentary context of 249: 15-19. That Lab'aya's Gezer speech should not be read as truculence is well argued by Moran, "Amarna Glosses", *RA*, 69 (1975), pp. 147-51.

<sup>62</sup> As e.g. in the control of the strategic Beth-She'an, pursuant to the alliance of Milkilim, Tagi, and the sons of Lab'aya as reported in 289: 5-20.

client-kings and in turn to control the trade-routes, than as imperial expansionism in the more conventional sense. Capture, then, of a city with consequent deposition of the kinglet would be contemplated only if the latter proved resistant.

While this scenario would find some support, especially when scholars relate their activity to that of the Habiru<sup>63</sup>, they do tend to be ambivalent in their descriptions.

(d) **Succession.** From the evidence of the letters mentioning them, the sons of Lab'aya seem simply to resume where their father left off and become as much a byword for sedition and terror as he. Though some revolt on Lab'aya's death (notably Gath-Padalla, see 250: 10-15) must be admitted, a widespread collapse of some "Lab'ayan empire" or hegemony seems somewhat stretched. As for Gath-Padalla, Ba'lu-mehir had been captured along with Lab'aya, but when they were both released the former managed to regain his place at Gath-Padalla and reconcile himself to Egypt.<sup>64</sup> Meanwhile, the sons of Lab'aya appear to be active very soon after their father's death. Letter 246: 5ff (rev.) hints that though Lab'aya has not been long dead<sup>65</sup>, yet already they are intriguing with the Habiru. From there in succeeding years they consolidate their power and influence.

All this is consistent with a smooth transition of power from father to the sons such that they have no internal problems, much less are they left without a capital or centre of operation. On the contrary, they are free to grasp firmly the external situation and move against their father's enemies, confirm former alliances, and re-establish control, all in a very short time.

One further consideration is the analogy of succession in other cities. According to Albright, kingship of a city-state came by normal dynastic succession. Thus he cites Milkilim, Iapahu, Ba'lu-Šipti in Gezer; Zimreda, Šipti-Ba'lu, Iabni-ili in Lachish.<sup>66</sup> This smooth succession would be altered, of course, if a weak ruler followed and was overthrown by insurrection from within, as with Yašdata in Ta'anach (?), or Zimreda of Lachish (though interpreta-

<sup>63</sup> As in Campbell, *art. cit.* # (n. 5), p. 20, and *supra*, n. 32.

<sup>64</sup> Rainey, *art. cit.* # (n. 4), pp. 11 — 12.

<sup>65</sup> *Chronology*, p. 108.

<sup>66</sup> CAH, p. 101. For the Lachish succession see *Chronology*, p. 101. Moran's rejection of Šipti-Ba'lu's rule at Gezer may, if accepted, weaken this point somewhat, but not decisively by any stretch. However, Moran's reasoning regarding the author of EA 294 is in my view not entirely convincing; Albright's position still has the edge. For Moran's discussion see *art. cit.* # (n. 60), pp. 153-5.

tion of 288: 43f is problematical<sup>67</sup>), or by a conqueror from without. However, from the evidence, the sons of Lab'aya display no such weakness. Quite the reverse! They arouse as many complaints, just as bitter, from the surrounding contemporaries (notably Abdi-heba and Šuwardata) as did Lab'aya. Again, this evidence is consistent with a smooth succession from father to son at Pella itself.

As for Lab'aya himself, while he is clearly concerned to control the western side of the Jordan, Mut-Ba'lu at a later stage is equally interested in control of the east. Though the activities of father and sons are not contemporary according to the documents, there may well have been some overlap for all that.<sup>68</sup> One could cite here the analogy of Zimreda and his brother Shipti-Ba'lu at Lachish where according to Campbell the latter was second-in-command as each supported the other in their separate schemes.<sup>69</sup>

An economic hypothesis which avoids unnecessary lacunae and unanswered questions therefore would surely suggest a Lab'ayan capital at Pella, succeeded to by his son Mut-Ba'lu on his father's death, with the other son as commander of the militia, or some similar position. A capital at this site is consistent with the northern scene of the activity of both father and sons in seeking control of the trade-arteries.

### **Egyptian Hegemony: a Tenuous hold in the Amarna Period?**

Such a relocation of Lab'aya's capital and sphere of activity carries wider historical implications. Space permits discussion of one such, viz. the nature of Egyptian presence in Amarna Palestine.

A conventional picture of Amarna Age Palestine in the standard histories is that Akhenaten's new theology was far more important to him "than all the provinces of Asia"<sup>70</sup>, and consequently the great

<sup>67</sup> Ross, *art. cit.* # (n. 6), pp. 66 — 68. As to the assassination of Zimreda, the relevant lines (288: 43 — 4) are another interpretative problem, in particular the verb *ig-gi-ú-šú*. Moran (MLEA, pp. 516-7, n. 10) seems to derive it from *naqû* "to sacrifice, immolate", and makes Zimreda to be the subject, not the object, as does Knudtzon.

<sup>68</sup> Campbell concedes this possibility, even though for him unlikely: *Chronology*, p. 97.

<sup>69</sup> So Campbell, *ibid*, p. 101. That the two were brothers is asserted by Albright, CAH, p. 105.

<sup>70</sup> See J. Breasted, *A History of Egypt*, New York, 1909, p. 36. Also echoed in popular literature, e.g. C. Pfeiffer, *Tell el-Amarna and the Bible*, Grand Rapids, Baker, 1963, p. 19.

empire established in the previous century was either thrown away or left to disintegrate. The Amarna letters generally, and the Lab'ayan hegemony in Palestine in particular, it is held, present a microcosm of that overall picture of disintegration, even though some, notably Gardiner<sup>71</sup>, raise questions about the original existence of that empire, and blame the father Amunhotep III as much as Akhenaten for the subsequent decline. This general picture, originating with Breasted, still continues even if some historians question this or that aspect or detail.<sup>72</sup> Some go even further, contending that Egyptian administration and control in Palestine had disintegrated almost to the point of chaos.<sup>73</sup>

Part of this scenario is the alleged Lab'ayan empire: only if Egyptian administration was weak could such a scoundrel build this "an empire within an empire". However, if, as argued above, his activity was more in the nature of terrorist razzias for control only of those cities which in turn controlled the trade routes, and in turn for the purpose of his own rapine and plunder, this picture of Egyptian breakdown should be modified at least. It was an age of intense competition for trade, and Egypt was above all concerned that the trading caravans continued to enjoy smooth passage.<sup>74</sup>

On the revision proposed, that Lab'aya should be placed at Pella, from where he pushed westward and south-westward to control the routes in northern Palestine through the strategic passes of what is conventionally called the Via Maris (along with the Transjordan routes to the east), he thereby had, or stood to have, a stranglehold on Egyptian trade. As this was for them the uppermost consideration, the Egyptian authorities acted pursuant to those interests and ordered his arrest! Where is the weakness or carelessness here? If trading flow was the chief consideration, then what we observe is Egyptian action to protect those interests by removing a notorious bandit. Should we expect more? As Aharoni well remarks, "..... the

<sup>71</sup> Sir Alan Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, London, Oxford University Press, 1961, p. 230.

<sup>72</sup> As in C.F. Aling, *Egypt and Bible History*, Grand Rapids, 1981, pp. 61 — 2; also Aharoni, LB, p. 170: "These texts reflect a certain weakening of Egyptian power ...". Even though Aharoni does represent a variation of the conventional view, it is a variation on a theme for all that.

<sup>73</sup> See discussion in Albright, CAH, p. 105f.; Campbell, *art. cit.* #(n. 5), p. 16. For a contrary, if overstated, view, see Aharoni, LB, p. 170.

<sup>74</sup> W.W. Hallo, and W. K. Simpson, *The Ancient Near East: A History*, New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971, p. 274. Note also Gardiner, *op. cit.* #(n. 65), p. 208f.

Egyptians simply refused to entangle themselves in the political intrigues between the many Canaanite kings so long as Egyptian interests were not in jeopardy. However, the moment those interests were endangered the Egyptians would step in and put down any rebellion".<sup>75</sup> Precisely so!

A further reinforcement of this reconstruction from another angle comes from Liverani's thesis<sup>76</sup> that the impression of "crisis" in Egyptian (mal)administration is a false one, due to misunderstandings on both sides. The repeated requests for Pharaoh to protect his lands, and for supply of troops (even with provisions) represents not a crisis but an opposition of two quite different concepts of overlord-vassal relationship. On one hand was the Hittite-Asiatic feudal model whereby a suzerain would guarantee the throne of his vassal with military protection in return for tribute and military troops; on the other was the Egyptian bureaucratic model whereby the 'divine' Pharaoh owed nothing to anyone and only intervened to protect his own interests. Whoever ruled, whether Hapiru or Hazannu, was for him a matter of supreme indifference.<sup>77</sup> The Syro-Palestinian vassal kings, used to the first concept, were puzzled and dismayed at Pharaoh's non-intervention and seeming carelessness. Lab'aya, for his part, understood better than most the meaning of the new situation and thus protested his loyalty and promised a continued flow of tribute, realizing that Pharaoh wanted no more than that. The only point to add here is the one already made, that when Lab'aya ventured too far and threatened those same interests the Pharaoh then (re)acted to protect them. Hence Lab'aya's arrest.

These two main factors, then, combine to entail a thorough revision of the traditional picture of Amarna Palestine and the alleged Egyptian decline. If, however, one still insists, pointing to indications of bureaucratic inefficiency and corruption as evidence of Egyptian disintegration (as noted eg. in EA 287:45-48), it can be replied that though some fracture lines there may have been at this time, to conclude that it was tenuous to the point of loss or chaotic to the point of collapse goes beyond what the evidence will permit. Egypt's administration was by nature heavily bureaucratic, and such fracture lines of corruption or inefficiency can occur in imperial

<sup>75</sup> Aharoni, LB, p. 170.

<sup>76</sup> M. Liverani, "Contrasti e confluenze di concenzioni politiche nell'età di El-Amarna", *RA*, 61 (1967), pp. 1-18.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid*, p. 16f.

bureaucracy at some points even in an empire at its height, as a study of both Roman and British imperial administrations in their respective provinces and dominions will reveal.<sup>78</sup> The Amarna letters at best give us a few somewhat ambiguous snapshots of that administration. Meanwhile, Egyptian concern for economic and mercantile control, according to the evidence, was maintained.

<sup>78</sup> Thus compare the appalling corruption in the Roman administration of Judea during the second procuratorial period (A.D. 44 — 66) where the rapacity of Felix, Albinus, and especially Florus knew no bounds. See F.F. Bruce, *New Testament History*, rev. ed., London, 1971, pp. 319-331. For the modern example, British imperial administration in India during the late Victorian period is a useful comparison. R. Hyam notes of that administration: "It was one of the most ponderous, ineffective, and intensely conservative bureaucracies the world has ever known. Although it was reasonably uncorrupt...", i.e. not entirely the latter! (Ronald Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century: 1815 — 1914*, London, Batsford, 1976, p.209). Yet in neither case did corruption or inefficiency weaken the imperial hold of either. In each case their power was at its height!

## THE GOSPEL OF BARNABAS AND THE SAMARITANS

BY

JOHN BOWMAN

In none of the works of those who have written on the Gospel of Barnabas has there been any suggestion that Samaritans would have contributed to that work. Laurence Ragg<sup>1</sup> in his fundamental edition and translation of the Italian original MS, while dismissing any connection with the prohibited Gospel of the Gelasian Decree, mentions *en passant* as possible a lost Gnostic Christian Gospel's influence, but he himself would date the work as not earlier than 1300 A.D..<sup>2</sup> He even suggests that Fra Marino<sup>3</sup>, who discovered the Gospel of Barnabas, could be its author, though he does not insist on this.

Seventy years later Luigi Cirillo and Michel Fremaux have published the Gospel of Barnabas with a French translation.<sup>4</sup> Cirillo in his *Recherches sur la composition et l'origine* of the said Gospel champions the alleged Hebrew Christian Gospel behind that of Barnabas.<sup>5</sup> Incidentally he finds the evidence for this in a section of the Gospel of Barnabas entitled as the Little Book of Elijah, which Ragg had pointed out as clearly showing medieval monastic influence.<sup>6</sup>

In 1984 David Sox published a little book on the Gospel of Barnabas.<sup>7</sup> Sox's main thesis is that Fra Marino<sup>8</sup> did indeed forge that Gospel as an instrument of vengeance against a prince of the Church who had persistently stood in the way of his advancement.

<sup>1</sup> *The Gospel of Barnabas*: Ragg L. and L., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1909, p. XLV, p. XXIX, p. XLVI and p. XLVII. Abbrev. Ragg.

<sup>2</sup> Ragg, p. XLII

<sup>3</sup> Ragg, p. XXXVII

<sup>4</sup> *Evangile de Barnabe*: Recherches sur la composition et l'origine par Luigi Cirillo, Texte et Traduction par Luigi Cirillo et Michel Fremaux, Preface d'Henri Corbin. Editions Beauchesne, Paris 1977. Abbr. EBV.

<sup>5</sup> EBV CXLV 354, where mention is made also of the true Pharisees (of Elijah's time) See also EBV Ch.VIII, pp. 223-238. Les "Vrais Pharisiens."

<sup>6</sup> Ragg, p. XXXV.

<sup>7</sup> *The Gospel of Barnabas*: Sox, David, Allen & Unwin, London 1984

<sup>8</sup> Sox, p. 65, 73.



One feels Sox would have been more convincing if he had been content to have Fra Marino the Inquisitor make use of heretical<sup>9</sup> material, to wit The Gospel of Barnabas which came into his hands.

That the basic structure of the Gospel of Barnabas is a rather loose Harmony of the Four Gospels, a sort of Diatessaron, had already been noticed and remarked on by Ragg<sup>10</sup>. Corbin in his Preface to the *Evangile de Barnabe* dubs the Gospel of Barnabas a *Harmonica Abrahamica*.<sup>11</sup> This is indeed a title which goes some way to explaining the ordering of the contents of the Gospel of Barnabas and that Gospel's implied aim, mutual understanding between Muslim, Christian and Jew. J.N.J. Kritzinger<sup>12</sup> in his 'A Critical Study of the Gospel of Barnabas' maintains that Barnabas was written by a Muslim who was very well acquainted with the Bible and wanted to create a Muslim Gospel for use in anti-Christian polemics. All of the above writers on Barnabas are convinced that it was written in Europe. Is this not primarily because it was written in Italian? Jean Richard's<sup>13</sup> *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem* is invaluable as showing the important significance of the Italian Traders, especially those from Genoa and Venice. While the First Kingdom of Jerusalem was politically French and a Feudal State, the Italian traders sought to carve out for themselves Genoan and Venetian enclaves. By the last decade of the 12th century the Italian enclaves were achieving total power because *Outremer* depended on the goodwill of Venice, Genoa and Pisa and their merchant ships. Incidentally it is worth noting Richard's statement:<sup>14</sup> "the Italians wanted to be answerable only to their prelates for the churches they possessed in Syria." In the same decade Pisa, Genoa, and Venice appointed consuls for the whole of Syria. Throughout the 13th century the Italians' mercantile power expanded as the political power of the Franks faded.

<sup>9</sup> Sox, p. 66.

<sup>10</sup> Ragg, p. XX.

<sup>11</sup> EBV Preface pp. 5,7.

<sup>12</sup> Kritzinger, J.N.J.: A Critical Study of the Gospel of Barnabas, pp. 49-65 in Religion in Southern Africa, Vol. I, Association for the History of Religion, Durban, January, 1980.

<sup>13</sup> *The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, vols. A. and B, Richard Jean, in *Europe in the Middle Ages*, Selected Studies, General Editor Richard Vaughan, University of Hull, North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, New York, Oxford, 1979, Richards, Vol. A, p. 276.

<sup>14</sup> Richards, Vol. B., p. 373.

The Mamluks under Baibars defeated the Mongols in 1260 at Ain Jalut<sup>15</sup>. Damascus taken by the Mongols with Christian help six months before was now Mamluk and with it Syria was in their hands. Palestine was next and in 1265 Caesarea and Haifa fell and three years later Jaffa. Of the ports necessary for the continual existence of *Outremer* Tripoli and Beirut having fallen in 1289, only Acre was left, and it fell in 1291. With Acre fell the Carmelite house on Mount Carmel. The Carmelite constitution of 1281<sup>16</sup> states "From the time when the prophets Elias and Eliseus dwelt devoutly on Mt. Carmel, holy fathers both of the old and new testament ..... lived praiseworthy lives in holy penitence by the fountain of Elias in a holy succession uninterruptedly maintained." This testifies to the mendicant order's belief (though only given papal approval in 1226) that holy anchorites from time immemorial had lived in solitude meditating on the psalms and only coming together on Sunday for mass. The writer of Barnabas in his section<sup>17</sup> "the little book of Elijah" seems to show his great respect and veneration for these medieval followers of Elijah and their devotion to the Psalms of the Old Testament. There seems no doubt<sup>18</sup> that his True Pharisees are the early Carmelite monks. The Gospel of Barnabas actually mentions Mt. Carmel. The Carmelite monks only returned to Mt. Carmel in the 17th century. Presumably the author of Barnabas either had known at first hand these anchorites of Mt. Carmel or had heard of them from some Maronite priest who had known them.

Damascus had never been captured by the Crusaders, though they tried and failed in 1126, 1128. But Damascus had a long and continuing interest for Christians. There had been Christians there who had baptised Paul and helped him escape over the city wall.<sup>19</sup> When the Ommayad Caliphate came in 635 the 15 Christian Churches<sup>20</sup> in Damascus then were spared. Though Melchite and Syrian

<sup>15</sup> See *The Oxford Illustrated History of Medieval Europe*, ed. by George Holms, U.U.P., 1988, especially 5 'The Mediterranean in the Age of the Renaissance 1200-1500' by Peter Denby, p. 260.

<sup>16</sup> See Art. Carmelites in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 3, McGraw Hill Book Company, New York.

<sup>17</sup> Ragg, p. 335 CXLV, 158b, p. 339 CXLV 160 a. Jesus here in the Gospel of Barnabas gives his strongest approval of Elijah and the religion of the true Pharisees.

<sup>18</sup> Ragg, p. 421, CLXXXVIII 119a.

<sup>19</sup> Acts 9:25.

<sup>20</sup> See art. Damascus *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. 4, Funk & Wagnall, New York, 1916.

rites predominated then and later, Maronites had a presence there. "Relations with Rome," states the New Catholic Encyclopaedia,<sup>21</sup> "were maintained fairly well into the Ottoman conquest. Jews have had from Old Testament times a presence in Damascus.<sup>22</sup> There is the so-called cave of Elisha<sup>23</sup> at Damascus, cf. the so-called fountain of Elijah on Carmel. Then there is the Damascus Document<sup>24</sup> telling of a Jewish sect in Damascus somehow connected with the Qumran Essenes. In crusading times were Jewish travellers<sup>25</sup> such as Benjamin of Tudela (1170) who tells of 3,000 Rabbinic Jews there. At the end of the 13th century the Mamluke Sultan of Egypt recognised Jesse b. Hezekiah of Damascus as prince and exilarch of the Jews. The Jews in Damascus in the Middle Ages were wealthy merchants and prospered so much so that Palestinian Jews in the 12th century left Palestine for Damascus to escape high taxes levied by the Crusaders. A well-established Samaritan community was also present in Damascus. When it originated is uncertain, but the troubles at Shechem caused by John Hyrcanus<sup>26</sup> in the second century B.C. may point, if not to its establishment, at least to its augmentation. Among the numerous Samaritan sects mentioned by Abu'l Fath there is that of the Essenes.<sup>27</sup> We have noted above the Jewish Damascus Document. Is it not possible that the Samaritan Essene sect arose among Samaritans in Damascus? In the 13th century we have the Samaritan Sadaqa Ben Manja Ben Sadaqa,<sup>28</sup> a physician and Penta-teuch commentator who belonged to the court of al-Maliku'l-Adil, the Ayyubid ruler of Damascus. Sadaqa wrote on the nature of God and man and the worship of God basing his argument on the

<sup>21</sup> See art. Damascus New Catholic Encyclopedia, vol, 4.

<sup>22</sup> See art. Damascus J.E.

<sup>23</sup> See art. Damascus J.E.

<sup>24</sup> Damascus Document or Zadokite Document, see Charles Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha vol. 2, Oxford 1913, pp. 797-834. Priests from Jerusalem withdrew in protest and in Damascus formed a body called 'The Sons of Zadok' under a leader called the Teacher of Righteousness whose memory was highly esteemed by the Qumran Essenes; see their *Manual of Discipline*.

<sup>25</sup> See art. Damascus J.E.

<sup>26</sup> According to Josephus Antiq. XIII IX II Hyrcanus took Shechem and Gerizim and left the temple there ruined. In Damascus they would be beyond Hyrcanus' reach.

<sup>27</sup> See J.W. Nutt, *Fragments of a Samaritan Targum*, Trubner & Co., London 1874, p. 46, citing Epiphanius *Haeres*, 1, p.28.

<sup>28</sup> See Nutt, *Sam. Targ.* p. 138, 142.

Pentateuch. The Samaritan<sup>29</sup> high priestly family was also in Damascus where at this period for 200 years there was a Samaritan High Priest at Damascus as well as at Nablus/Shechem until in 1528 A.D. the High Priest Pinhas was brought from Damascus to Nablus. In 1616 Petro della Valle, helped by a Maronite priest who introduced him to the Samaritans in Damascus, managed to buy from them the first Samaritan Pentateuch (in Hebrew) to be seen in Europe.

As to the Gospel of Barnabas, the basic plan of its author was to exalt Ishmael<sup>30</sup> over Isaac and Muhammad over Jesus. John the Baptist<sup>31</sup> who features in the Qur'an disappears from this Gospel. Jesus<sup>32</sup> is now the forerunner of the Messiah Muhammad. Judas<sup>33</sup> is the crucified. Jesus<sup>34</sup> is translated to the third heaven. He will return<sup>35</sup> and show he did not die and then on the third day go to the third heaven again. The author of the Gospel of Barnabas uses the Four Gospels recognised by the Church Catholic (and as selected and altered by him) as the ground for presenting his own views. He was never a Christian nor a Jew, but a Samaritan, now officially a

<sup>29</sup> See Cowley, A.E. *The Samaritan Liturgy*, vol. II, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1909, pp. XXIX-XXXI.

<sup>30</sup> Ragg, p. 103, XLIII 46a. Jesus citing Ps. 110:1 as in Mk. 12:36, 37 says: "If the Messenger of God whom ye called the Messiah were the son of David, how should David call him lord? Believe me for verily I say to you that the promise was made in Ishmael, not in Isaac." See also *ibid*, p. 331 CCXI 201b "In the true book of Moses it is written that Ishmael is the father of the Messiah and Isaac the father of the messenger of the Messiah". *Ibid* 202a "Moses cried out with joy on being shown by God Ishmael: 'O Ishmael, thou hast in thine arms all the world of Paradise! Be mindful of me, God's servant, that I may find grace in God's sight by means of thy son {Muhammad} for whom God hath made all.'"

<sup>31</sup> John the Baptist is mentioned in Qur'an Sura III:39; VI:86; XIX: 7, 12; XXI: 90.

<sup>32</sup> Ragg, p. 99, XLII 43b Jesus here says: "I am not worthy to unloosen the shoes of the messenger of God whom ye call Messiah who was made before me, and shall come after me 'and shall bring the words of truth: so that his faith shall have no end'" See also *ibid* p. 223 XCI 102b.

<sup>33</sup> Ragg, p. 471. CCXVI 222a. Judas was transfigured by God in speech and looks so that the disciples and the soldiers thought he was Jesus. Ragg, p. 473 CCXVII 222b - p. 481 CCXVIII 227a describes the passion and crucifixion of Judas.

<sup>34</sup> Ragg, p. 471 CCXV 221b. Before Judas and the soldiers could take Jesus, God commanded Gabriel, Michael, Rafael and Uriel, his ministers, to take Jesus out of the world .... "They bore him and placed him in the third heaven in the company of angels blessing God for evermore".

<sup>35</sup> Ragg, p. 483 CCIX 228a: Jesus prayed God to see his mother and his disciples and the four archangels bring Jesus to his mother's house. Jesus, 229a, assures them "I have not been dead at all, for God hath reserved me till the end of the world". On the third day the four archangels (p. 489 CCXVI 231a) carried him up into heaven. This is the Gospel of Barnabas' version of the Ascension.

Muslim. Until now nobody has recognised that the author of the Gospel of Barnabas was a Samaritan because none of the scholars who have written about the Gospel of Barnabas knew about Samaritanism. Central for Samaritan religion is Mt. Gerizim. Its summit is Bethel, the House of God, from which the High Priest and he alone and only there could give the priestly blessing. The holy place on the summit was the goal of the Festival pilgrimages. Churches and Temples have stood near the top of Mt. Gerizim, but they were not true Samaritan. The mountain itself was God's Temple not made by human hands. Yusuf Ibn Salama<sup>36</sup> in the 11th century mentions a Samaritan synagogue at the foot of the mountain; but the priestly blessing could not be pronounced there. Samaritan religion was tied to Mt. Gerizim and in the control of the High Priests in whose hands were the ashes of the Red Heifer<sup>37</sup> basic for the whole system of levitical purity. Judaism had such a system of Tohorot but it passed out of the power of the priests after 70 A.D. The notable thing about Samaritan sects<sup>38</sup> is their antagonism to Mt. Gerizim and its Festivals, the dating of which was controlled by the priests there. Such antagonism must have been perpetuated by Samaritan priests and laity in the Diaspora; true Mt. Gerizim was their qiblah for prayers, and they could make pilgrimages (with increasing difficulty and inconvenience thither); but in Samaritanism the recognition by the Samaritan High Priests at Mt. Gerizim of the full validity of Synagogue worship, especially in the Diaspora, was painfully slow in coming. It is not surprising that Samaritans in the Diaspora saw themselves as different from the Samaritans at Mt. Gerizim and let themselves pass in the eyes of the people among whom they lived and worked, as Jews or Muslims.

In the Gospel of Barnabas, Samaritans are mentioned, e.g. Jn 4:9 Jesus and the Samaritan woman. Jesus' answer (v. 21) to her statement 'Our fathers worshipped in this mountain' is not markedly

<sup>36</sup> See Nutt. Sam. Targ., p. 140. Yusuf was the author of al-Kafi treating inter-alia the office of the priest, and of purifications etc.

<sup>37</sup> See: "Did the Qumran Sect burn the Red Heifer?" Bowman, J. in *Revue de Qumran* 1958). The Samaritan Chronicle Tolidah (Nabulus autograph) 13a mentions that in a marginal note in 532 A.H. that the ashes from sacrificially burnt Red Heifers mixed with water were still being used for purification.

<sup>38</sup> See *Samaritan Documents Relating to their History, Religion and Life*, Bowman, John, The Pickwick Press, Pittsburgh, Pa 1977, pp. 162-174 translated from the Arabic text of Abu'l Fath on these sects, and pp. 205-213 for critical and explanatory notes on Abu'l Fath's statements about these sects in his *History of the Samaritans*.

different from the Canonical Gospel. The Gospel of Barnabas has next "And turning to the woman he said: 'O woman, ye Samaritans worship that which ye know not, but we Hebrews worship that which we know'"; closely following Jn 4:22. But Jesus in the Gospel of Barnabas emphatically asserts "the promise of God was made in Jerusalem in the Temple of Solomon, and not elsewhere." The Samaritan place of worship and presumably its priests are completely discounted. But the Gospel of Barnabas<sup>39</sup> has Jesus assure "a time will come when God will give his mercy in another city" (Mecca?) then adds "and in every place it will be possible to worship him in truth": cf. Jn. 4:23. When the Samaritan woman asks if Jesus is the Messiah, Jesus in the Gospel of Barnabas affirms<sup>40</sup> "I am indeed sent to the house of Israel as a prophet of salvation, but after me shall come the Messiah sent of God to the world, for whom God hath made the world."

The Gospel of Barnabas has the parable of the Good Samaritan. In the parable the Jewish priest and levite, presumably thinking that the injured man is dead,<sup>41</sup> passed by on the other side for the very good reason that they did not want to incur corpse uncleanness. Now the Samaritan put that aside and helped. That is not to say that the uncleanness laws meant nothing to the Samaritans. The Mishnah Ber. 7:1 does admit that what laws the Samaritans kept, they kept more strictly<sup>42</sup> than the Jews. It would not really be a contrast if the Samaritan did not start off with the same sort of handicap as the Jewish priest and levite. So presumably Samaritan here means a priestly Samaritan or at least a Samaritan labouring under Samaritan priestly laws of Tohorot. In Jn. 8:5 Jesus is called a Samaritan. This is retained in the Gospel of Barnabas<sup>43</sup>, but later, following a statement<sup>44</sup> made by Jesus that it is the son of Abraham, Ishmael, from whom will descend the Messiah, the cry goes up "stone the impious one. This is an Ishmaelite." So Jesus is both a Samaritan and an Ishmaelite, which for Barnabas was not beyond the bounds of

<sup>39</sup> Ragg, p. 189, LXXII, 85a, 85b.

<sup>40</sup> Ragg, p. 191 LXXXIII 85b

<sup>41</sup> Ragg, p. 67 XXX 31a, 31b. The man on the road was left by the robbers 'half dead'.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. e.g. the law of Niddah see T.B. Hullin 4a Niddah 58b. Cf. also T.B. Hullin 4a.

<sup>43</sup> Ragg, p. 457 CCVI, 214 b.

<sup>44</sup> Ragg, p. 459 CCVIII 216a.

possibility. There is still the case of the Samaritan leper<sup>45</sup> who on being healed turned back to Jesus instead of going on to show himself to a priest. In the Gospel of Barnabas<sup>46</sup> 'Samaritan' is replaced by Ishmaelite.

The Gospel of Barnabas<sup>47</sup> mentions "an old book written by the hand of Moses and Joshua ..... which book is the true book of Moses..... The High Priest<sup>48</sup> forbade the reading of it, saying that an Ishmaelite had written it. The Jews and the Samaritans severally claimed that they and they alone had the true Law of God,<sup>49</sup> and the perfect text thereof. Not only so, but the Samaritan sectarian Dusis<sup>50</sup> had challenged the official text of the Samaritan Torah, and his followers wanted acceptance of his version as supporting their views which were highly critical of the Mt. Gerizim centred priesthood festivals and sacrifices. Reading the Gospel of Barnabas one is reminded of such views which could have survived that sect, and found fruitful ground for growth in the Samaritan diaspora in Damascus. The High Priest who is mentioned in the Gospel of Barnabas as not permitting the Scribe (Barnabas?) to study further the old book written by the hand of Moses and Joshua, alleging that an Ishmaelite had written it, could be the Samaritan High Priest, either the one who reigned in the mount of God Gerizim or the other Samaritan High Priest who in the fourteenth century still lodged in Damascus striving to uphold the old priestly traditions of Samaritans, though in exile. On his lips Ishmaelite as a term for Samaritans, of sectarian views is quite realistic. Actually it was in the mid-14th century that the High Priest Pinhas b. Joseph at Shechem did claim to discover the Abisha scroll of the Torah written by the great grandson of Aaron the brother of Moses. Mention of Joshua along with Moses as having written the book of the Law is of significance in connection with the Samaritans. For orthodox Samaritans the Torah is their complete Bible. There is however the Samaritan Book of Joshua.<sup>51</sup> the Arabic MS of which Scaliger

<sup>45</sup> Lk. 17:16.

<sup>46</sup> Ragg, p.39 XIX 19b.

<sup>47</sup> Ragg, p. 427, CXCI 201b.

<sup>48</sup> Ragg, p. 429, CXCI 201a.

<sup>49</sup> E.g. the Samaritan Tenth Commandment basically Dt. 27:5a reading in 4b Mt. Gerizim instead of Mt. Ebal as in M.T. The Qur'an itself charges both Jews and Christians with falsification of the Scriptures e.g. Qur'an II:79; III:78.

<sup>50</sup> Dusis, see: *Samaritan Documents*, p. 166 III, and the information cited by Abu'l Fath on how Dusis had altered much of the Law (Taurat).

<sup>51</sup> See *Samaritan Documents*, pp. 61-70

obtained from Egyptian Samaritans in 1584. The earliest part of the MS is dated 1362 A.D., the latter part 1513. The first eight chapters overlap with the end of Deuteronomy as a sort of restatement thereof, bringing Joshua into close relationship with Moses who approves him to be his successor. Chapters 9-24 have a considerable resemblance to the LXX Biblical Book of Joshua, but chapters 26-37, though still dealing with Joshua, are haggadah, not actual history, but put forward as such. It is a chronicle of a sort. The Samaritan book of Joshua would have formed a part of Samaritan apologetic literature of the Hellenistic period. It witnesses to the Samaritan concept of *Ridwan*<sup>52</sup> and *Panutha*: *Ridwan* being the period of Divine Grace continuing from Sinai to Eli, *Panutha* that from Eli on.

The major part of the *Tolidah*,<sup>53</sup> or Annals of the Samaritan High Priests, was written by Jacob the son of Ishmael in 1346/7 A.D., who was Samaritan High Priest in Damascus. Could the writer of the Gospel of Barnabas belong to this family referred to in Samaritan sources as *banu Ismael*? He may be thinking of other Samaritans, not of his own family but of his own religious views when he changed Samaritan in the Gospel to Ishmaelite. It is significant that Damascus<sup>54</sup> is made to figure in Jesus' ministry according to the Gospel of Barnabas. It is not mentioned in the Four Canonical Gospels. The *Tolidah*<sup>55</sup> notes that at the end of the highpriesthood of Eleazar "Muhammad arose and he was a prophet among the Ishmaelites in the town of Mecca, and he treated all the Samaritans well." Later in the *Tolidah* there is mention of one High Priest<sup>56</sup> Ismael "who left the law," i.e. became Muslim. It is significant that Muhammad is called a prophet especially in the *Tolidah* written by Samaritan High

<sup>52</sup> See *Samaritan Documents*, p. 104.

<sup>53</sup> See *Samaritan Documents*, p. 37, p.45.

<sup>54</sup> Damascus. Ragg, p. 323 CXXXIX 152b, and p. 531 CXLIV 156b, both Jesus and his disciples spend time in Damascus.

<sup>55</sup> See *Transcript of the Original Text of the Samaritan Chronicle Tolidah* (with a critical introduction), Bowman, John, University of Leeds; Dept. of Semitic Languages, p. 7. For a Samaritan High Priest to say Muhammad was a Prophet is itself amazing, because it is a Samaritan dogma that there were *no* prophets in Israel after Moses unless it be 'a prophet like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken' promised in Dt. 18:15, 18.

<sup>56</sup> Ishmael High Priest in Damascus until the year 752 A.H. And he was bribed and left the Law (Torah) so *Tolidah*. He was the son of the Damascus High Priest Jacob, who wrote the Introduction to the *Tolidah* on the Samaritan Calendar "for my son the sun of science and the secret treasure of knowledge, Ishmael." See *Samaritan Documents*, p. 45.



Priests, because there was no prophet after Moses. It was part of the heresy of the Samaritan Dusis that he proclaimed himself a prophet<sup>57</sup>; but it perhaps explains how later Samaritans knew, in addition to Joshua, the prophets of the Jewish Bible. The author of the Gospel of Barnabas, if a Samaritan infected by sectarian views, could show his knowledge of such and approve their words as suited him.

If the writer of the Gospel of Barnabas were a Samaritan, neither Judaism, Christianity nor Islam would accept that he as such was a descendant<sup>58</sup> of Abraham. If in Damascus he associated with sectarian Samaritans or held their views, his priestly Samaritan brethren there and chiefly in Nablus would on their part disown him, as no true son of Abraham. Judaism followed by Christianity and Islam denied the validity of Samaritanism's claim to be a Religion of the Book. As a result, under Islam, Samaritans were not *Ablu'l-Kitab*,<sup>59</sup> People of the Book, like Jews and Christians. Samaritans were outsiders, and not to be accorded protection. If, however, even a Samaritan became a Muslim such a one not only gained status in the contemporary Islamic world, but he found his Abrahamic birthright that others had denied him. What the narrow Orthodox Samaritan of his time had called him and those like him for what in their eyes appeared islamizing tendencies Ishmaelite, he makes a badge of honour. In the one place where the French scholars of EBV<sup>60</sup> do comment on Ishmaelites they suggest tentatively that the Ismaili sect of the Shi'is is meant. But this is unconvincing.

It is Ishmael the Son of the Patriarch Abraham who is of paramount importance in the Gospel of Barnabas. The Ismailis took their name from Ismail the Seventh Shi'a Imam. Neither the Seventh Imam nor his followers are envisaged by the author of Barnabas. The Qur'an emphasises that Ishmael is the firstborn son of Abraham and that Ishmael is a prophet of God.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> See *Samaritan Documents*, pp. 165, 166 in the translated extracts from Abu'l Fath's History.

<sup>58</sup> See Nutt, *Samaritan Targum*, Introduction, p. 44: No Samaritan was to be received as a proselyte to Judaism. None would have a share in the Resurrection citing Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer, ch. 38.

<sup>59</sup> It is possible that the Qur'an Sura XX: 85, 87, 95, 97, which tells how Samiri misled Israel by making the (golden) calf for them to worship, means thereby the Samaritans: so Baidawi in his *Tafsir*. Baidawi actually says as-Samiri is Musa Zafar of the tribe of the Samaritans (who were not *Ablu'l-Kitab*)

<sup>60</sup> EBV CXLII, note 5.

<sup>61</sup> Qur'an II:125, 127; II:133, 136.

The author of the Gospel of Barnabas had probably seen but certainly heard that the might of the Christian Crusader knights and their priests had been utterly humbled. This reflected badly on their Christ, the descendant of David<sup>62</sup> and through him of Isaac. The western Christians had been humbled by the victorious Muslims, the followers of Muhammad the descendant of Ishmael. In the first place no Samaritan, whether orthodox or sectarian, could accept a Davidic Messiah. The Qur'an is more charitable towards David. The Samaritan equivalent of the Jewish Messiah is the Taheb, the Returning One or the Restorer, who is the one like to Moses of Deut. 18:18. The belief in the Taheb was probably originally introduced by sectarian Samaritans. The full development of the Taheb doctrine is in the lengthy hymn by Abisha ben Pinhas<sup>63</sup> of the Damascus connection. The astonishing thing about the Gospel of Barnabas is the number of times Jesus denies he is the Messiah, but is only the forerunner of the Messiah. Christ<sup>64</sup> is a European term in a way the Messiah is not; the one is Greek in origin, the other West Asian. The Gospel of Barnabas makes the European Christian Christ only the forerunner of the Muhammedan Messiah. It is as if the God of the defeated Crusaders is defeated too by the Prophet of the Conqueror and that Prophet willy-nilly finds Messiahship foisted on him; but a Messiahship going back far beyond David to Ishmael and not Isaac; but in doing so it re-emphasises the fundamental Abrahamic revelation shared by Judaism and Islam and also Christianity. These three agree on at least this: Samaritanism does not stem from the genuine Abrahamic root and they are not heirs to the promise, either.

The Gospel of Barnabas<sup>65</sup> shows awareness of the Papal decrees

<sup>62</sup> See Qur'an XVII: 55; IV: 163.

<sup>63</sup> See Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy*, Oxford, 1909, vol. 2, Prayers for the Day of Atonement, pp. 513-514.

<sup>64</sup> Jesus is still 'Christ' in the Gospel of Barnabas in three places. The title is the Gospel of Jesus, called Christ, a new prophet sent by God into the world. Ragg, p. 3a. Herod asks the priests and scribes "Where should Christ be born?" Ragg, p. 76, Ragg, p. 163 LXX 72a. In answer to Jesus' question to the disciples: 'What say ye I am?' Peter answered "Thou art Christ, son of God." (cf. Mt. 16:16). In the Gospel of Barnabas this provokes from Jesus Mt. 16:23. Not from God cf. Mt. 16:17f., but the Devil made Peter say this according to the Gospel of Barnabas' Jesus. In fact he says to the disciples "Woe to you if ye believe this, for I have won from God a great curse against those who believe this ..."

<sup>65</sup> Ragg, p. 191, LXXXII, 85b "Jesus speaking to the Samaritan woman says that when the Messiah (i.e. Muhammad) comes the year of the Jubilee, which now comes every hundred years, shall by the Messiah be reduced to every year in every place". See also Ragg, p. 193 LXXXIII 87a where this information about the

between 1300 and 1340 providing for a jubilee each 100 years. Since both communities of Jews and Samaritans in Damascus were familiar with the ruling of the Mosaic Law to celebrate the Jubilee every 50 years, not that they were ever able in this imperfect world to carry it out; news of the Roman Catholic 100 years Jubilee brought to their notice in Damascus, if not by the Maronite churchmen, certainly by the Italian traders, themselves Roman Catholic, would excite interest. The Hebrew Jubilee began in Tishri the seventh month. Jesus in His<sup>66</sup> sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth at the opening of His ministry quoted from Isa. 61:2 proclaiming the Jubilee. It is strange then that the author of the Gospel of Barnabas<sup>67</sup> should charge the Festival of the Jews mentioned in Jn. 2:13 to the Feast of Tabernacles, which falls in Tishri rather than Passover that falls in Nisan. It is true also that elsewhere the Gospel of Barnabas shows knowledge of Lent as kept by Western Roman Catholics. This does not prove that the author of Barnabas was a European Roman Catholic nor that the Gospel of Barnabas was written in Europe. For 200 years the Crusaders were in *Outremer*; they doubtless had kept Lent. Furthermore Italian traders were still in and around Damascus in the 14th century, Jews of Damascus were merchants; it is likely that the

Jubilee is repeated to the disciples. Jesus said to the disciples: "That night will be in the time of the Messiah, messenger of God, the Jubilee every year — that cometh every hundred years". This cannot be the Hebrew Jubilee which recurred every fiftieth year (Lev. 25:11), and the Qur'an is innocent of Jubilees. "There remains, then, the Jubilee of Western Christendom and there was only one 'period, as far as we know when the celebration would have been spoken of recurring every 100 years'. The first recorded Jubilee is that of Boniface VIII in 1300, the second that of Clement VI in 1350. This would give us precisely the first half of the fourteenth century as the period in which the passage in question must have been written". See Ragg, p. XLII.

<sup>66</sup> Lk. 4:19 "to preach the acceptable year of the Lord". For Samaritans the idea of the Jubilee was linked to renewal of *Ridwan*, Divine Favour initiated with the coming of the Taheb. How natural then for a Samaritan convert to Islam to see the revelation to Muhammad as inaugurating with Islam a perpetual Jubilee.

<sup>67</sup> Ragg, p. 67, XXXb, 31a: "Jesus went to Jerusalem near unto the Senefegia (= Tabernacles) a feast of our nation". Cf. Jn 7:2 "the Jews' feast of Tabernacles". The approach of the Feast of Tabernacles is not in Jn. 2:13. "But there the Jews' passover was at hand, and Jesus went to Jerusalem". There is no need to suggest that the writer of the Gospel of Barnabas substituted in his calendar Tabernacles for Passover in Nisan, though among the Samaritans the Sabu'ai had their own calendar they could commence the religious year in the early autumn (see Nutt pp. 47, 48), and could have actually celebrated Tabernacles in Nisan. What is more likely is that the author of the Gospel of Barnabas was influenced by the Jubilee theme in Jesus' Nazareth sermon in Lk. 4:16-19. In any case the abundance of wine in John's story of Jesus' first miracle could suggest a Tabernacles time frame. See Ragg, XV, 13b.

Samaritans there were merchants too. Samaritans in dealing with Italian traders would, as they did business with them, pick up information about religious practices. Our author, if a Samaritan of Damascus, probably found it safest to appear outside the confines of his community as a Muslim even before professing Islam. The constant refrain of the Samaritan Liturgy is "There is no God but God" which is the first part of the Muslim Creed. All that is required is to add 'and Muhammad is the Apostle of God.' Samaritanism is stricter even than Judaism in constantly affirming absolutely strict Monotheism. Islam socially and politically was dominant. Islam provided openarmed welcome to the Believer whatever he had been before, and he was no longer the butt of the Jew and the Christian scorn. But he was still aware of the continuing tragedy of disunion and dissention between Jew, Christian and Muslim in matters of religion. He as an erstwhile Samaritan and now Muslim could not accept Jesus as Divine. He, like Jews, could not accept Jesus as Messiah, though Muslims could. The Muslims following the Qur'an<sup>68</sup> could not believe that God allowed Jesus to be crucified. He, by utilizing the Gnostic<sup>69</sup> story that actually it was Judas who was crucified in Jesus' stead neutralises completely the significance of the Crucifixion on which the Medieval Church built so much. It is a brilliant move on his part to utilise too Jn 14:26 and Jesus' promise of the Paraklete and to identify this with Ahmad/Muhammad and from this to go on to displace John the Baptist making his role be subsumed in the ministry of Jesus the forerunner of the Messiah Muhammad.

Are we to believe that he did not know that the Muslims did not believe in Muhammad as the Messiah? Or did he do so deliberately. If so why? The Samaritan Taheb has been called the Samaritan Messiah. If our author is a Samaritan did he really accept Muhammad as the Taheb? Is he really devising a Gospel in which he is calling on Christians, Jews and Samaritans to see Muhammad as the true Abrahamic Messiah? An Ishmaelite Messiah would have been more

<sup>68</sup> Qur'an III: 54-55 where nothing is said of the Crucifixion, but only God causing him to ascend to Him until the Day of the (general) resurrection.

<sup>69</sup> That Simon of Cyrene, who carried Jesus' cross (Mk. 15:21) and was crucified and died instead of Jesus, was held by Basilides. In the Nag Hammadi Apocalypse of Peter, he (Peter) is convinced that he sees Jesus being prepared for crucifixion yet there is at the same time a happy laughing Jesus above the substitute who had carried the cross. See *Gnosticism Its History and Influence*, Benjamin Walker, The Aquarian Press, Wellingborough, U.K., 1983, p.77.

attractive to Samaritans than a Davidic Messiah. Corbin sees our author as producing a harmony between Christian, Jew and Muslim. I believe that he is right so far as he goes. To achieve his purpose each religion had to give up something and accept something. I believe he was able to do so only because he was a Samaritan and could look on these religions from the outside while nominally a Muslim, but still a Samaritarian and Samaritarianism provided the catalyst, for Samaritanism was nearer to Islam than either Judaism or Christianity. Perhaps he hoped thereby to change Islam, e.g. Muhammad to be accepted by Muslims as Messiah.

There have been many Jewish Messianic claimants and none have been accepted yet in Judaism. To promote Muhammad as Messiah is perhaps the strangest of all and yet he showed in his life much of the features of a hoped-for Messiah and, though not a Jew, he was a descendant of Abraham but not through Isaac but Ishmael. The Christian, though schooled in Paul and the Creeds, would in Muhammad find a prophet and a successful leader of men and some even a saviour, but not their Christ figure which owes little to Jesus the man of Galilee. But even Barnabas' scaled-down Christ is not as real as the Christ of the Four Gospels.<sup>70</sup> Despite denial of his Divinity he is a less real man. After reading the Gospel of Barnabas and his picture of Christ the Forerunner one might turn in relief to Muhammad and his Qur'an. For the Gospel of Barnabas presents a Christ who demands circumcision as fundamental to obtain salvation, a thing Islam does not do.

So the Gospel of Barnabas itself, if written in Italian in Damascus, could be transported through Venetian traders who frequented important trade centres and through them would be introduced to Italy where, eventually, it would fall into an Inquisitor's hands.

<sup>70</sup> Samaritans, even more than Jews, regarded circumcision as the covenant of Abraham absolutely fundamental. In the Gospel of Barnabas, (Ragg, p.47 XXIII 22b), in a sermon on circumcision, Jesus said: "Leave fear to him that hath not circumcised his foreskin, for he is deprived of paradise".

## חֶסֶד — A STUDY OF A LEXICAL FIELD

BY

GORDON R. CLARK

It is widely acknowledged that חֶסֶד, which occurs 245 times in the Hebrew Bible, is extremely difficult to translate into English — and, for that matter, into many other languages. There is no single equivalent for חֶסֶד in our language. Leon Morris<sup>1</sup> draws attention to the difficulties translators have experienced, and he notes the great variety of words used to translate חֶסֶד. The translators of the King James Version used mercy words 155 times, kindness words 43 times, lovingkindness 30 times, goodness words 14 times, but love words are never used. In the Revised Standard Version, love words occur 182 times, kindness words 29 times, loyalty words 21 times, but mercy words only twice. Love words are used 149 times in the New English Bible, 162 times in the Good News Bible, and 171 times in the New International Version; kindness words occur in these versions 4 times, 19 times, and 49 times respectively, while loyalty words appear 61, 20 and 3 times respectively. Goodness words do not appear at all in these three translations, and mercy words only 7 times in the New International Version but never in the other two versions.

183 of the 245 occurrences of חֶסֶד in the Hebrew Bible refer to God's activity. 123 references to these actions of God appear in the Psalms, and it is often assumed that poetical passages do not make a great contribution to an attempt to define the content of a word. But there are less than 60 references to human חֶסֶד outside the Psalms, so the number of occurrences of the word is almost the same for both divine and human חֶסֶד. It is necessary to make this point because previous studies have almost invariably described human חֶסֶד first and then proceeded from the known to the unknown, discussing the חֶסֶד of God in terms of what has been discovered about human חֶסֶד. The amount of material available, it must be emphasised, makes it

<sup>1</sup> Leon Morris, *Testaments of Love*, Grand Rapids, 1981. His chapter on חֶסֶד is entitled 'Love and loyalty'; see especially pp. 65-66.

possible to start by describing divine חֶסֶד, the quality which Yahweh so frequently demonstrates and which he expects his people to emulate, even though man's expression of it can be only a pale reflection of Yahweh's. Further, with the exception of Stoebe's article<sup>2</sup> 'חֶסֶד — Güte,' previous studies have been essentially the investigation of a single word; but when the word is examined in its relationships with other words in the same semantic area, it is found that the references in the Psalms and in other poetic material can make a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the meaning of חֶסֶד.

A recent study<sup>3</sup> of a lexical field centered on the word חֶסֶד has confirmed some of the discoveries made in their previous investigations of this word by Nelson Glueck<sup>4</sup> and Katharine Sakenfeld<sup>5</sup>. It has also provided fresh insights into the nature and meaning of חֶסֶד — insights that escaped the attention of those investigators whose primary interest was in the word itself. This confirms that there are advantages to be gained by examining a group of words whose meanings are inter-related instead of concentrating on a single word.

This essay first describes briefly the field and the method adopted to examine it. Then it indicates some of the features which confirm Glueck's affirmation that אֱמֻנָה and אֱמֶת are frequently closely linked with חֶסֶד. Next it outlines the parameters which Sakenfeld devised to specify the situations in which the use of the word חֶסֶד is appropriate, and shows that these parameters also apply to various expressions in which טוֹב may be regarded as a substitute for חֶסֶד. This leads to an additional parameter that distinguishes חֶסֶד from טוֹב in these passages, and enables a more satisfactory description of חֶסֶד to be formulated. Finally, a brief and tentative examination is made of a lexical field of חֶסֶד as it is used in the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Hans Joachim Stoebe, 'חֶסֶד — Güte' in *Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann, München, 1971.

<sup>3</sup> Gordon R. Clark, *The Word חֶסֶד in the Hebrew Bible: A Study of a Lexical Field* (Unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Melbourne, 1989).

<sup>4</sup> Nelson Glueck, *Hesed in the Bible*, Cincinnati, 1967. This is the English translation, by Alfred Gottschalk, of *Das Wort hesed im alttestamentlichen Sprachgebrauch* [BZAW 47], Berlin, 1927.

<sup>5</sup> Katharine Doob Sakenfeld, *The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible*, Missoula, 1978.

<sup>6</sup> I am greatly indebted to Professor Takamitsu Muraoka for suggesting that I should prepare an article outlining some of the results obtained in my study of the חֶסֶד field. He also pointed out that a similar investigation of the usage of חֶסֶד in the

## 1. THE LEXICAL FIELD.

More than thirty years ago, James Barr advocated that the principles of structural semantics, and especially the examination of lexical fields, should be applied to biblical languages.<sup>7</sup> Since then scholars have investigated several Old Testament lexical fields. Major works include those by Sawyer, Riesener and Shults;<sup>8</sup> and among shorter studies are those of Balentine and Donald.<sup>9</sup> In such studies, it is important to specify the literary corpus in which the lexical field is found. A widely accepted principle in semantic studies states that synchronic description precedes diachronic description; it is therefore necessary to commence with a synchronic investigation — one which considers either the works of a single author, or works of different authors who wrote contemporaneously, or a text as it existed at a certain point in time.

The text of the Hebrew Bible has an extensive literary history covering an extended period, and it was decided to establish the lexical field of **הָסֵד** in the text as it existed early in the eleventh century A. D. This version of the vocalised Masoretic Text is a well-defined literary corpus — known as the Leningrad Codex. The major part of the study was confined to the text as published in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*.

The lexical field initially consisted of the derivatives of six Hebrew roots, which were known to be used frequently in situations that involve two persons or groups of persons. This step was taken in full cognisance of Barr's trenchant criticism<sup>10</sup> of those who place "excessive emphasis on the meaning of the 'root' of Hebrew words." This 'root fallacy,' as he calls it, often occurs when "etymological associations are allowed to do the work in interpretation that should be

Dead Sea Scrolls would be most valuable, and I am most grateful that he has encouraged me to set my hand to this task.

<sup>7</sup> James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language*, Oxford, 1961.

<sup>8</sup> John F. A. Sawyer, *Semantics in Biblical Research*, London, 1962; Ingrid Riesener, *Der Stamm עבד im Alten Testament* [BZAW 149], Berlin, 1979; and Fount L. Shults, **שָׁלַם** and **תָּמַם** in *Biblical Hebrew*, Ann Arbor, 1974.

<sup>9</sup> Samuel E. Balentine, 'A description of the semantic field of Hebrew words for "hide",' 1980 [*VT* 30, pp. 137-153]; and Trevor Donald, 'The semantic field of "folly" in Proverbs, Job, Psalms, and Ecclesiastes,' 1963 [*VT* 13, pp. 285-292], and 'The semantic field of rich and poor in the Wisdom literature of Hebrew and Accadian,' 1964 [*Oriens Antiquus* 3, pp. 27-41].

<sup>10</sup> James Barr, *op. cit.*, pp. 100-106.



done by semantics on the basis of actual usage.”<sup>11</sup> However, John Sawyer<sup>12</sup> suggests it is possible that “the root of a Semitic word is of some particular importance in communicating information.” He responds to an article by Barr dealing with words derived from the root אָמַן, and concludes that “we are not justified in dismissing the idea that the etymological group of words has some common semantic element in it too.” In other words, the root אָמַן “is a sense-bearing element in the two words ... communicating ... some idea of firmness after all.”

It was, however, their usage which was the primary consideration in the selection of the 35 derivatives of the six roots, namely: חָסַד, אָמַן, רָחַם, חָנַן, אָהַב and שָׁנָא, as the members of the lexical field. These derivatives occur 1368 times in the Hebrew Bible. Each of these occurrences was examined carefully to determine the agent — the person acting in the manner indicated by the keyword — and the patient — the person to whom (or for whose benefit) the action was directed. The persons involved included God and humans; the human parties were further classified as a leader, a man, or a woman. Often — but never with the derivatives of חָסַד and רָחַם — the patient was not a person but an inanimate entity; all passages which included a non-personal factor were deleted in order to focus attention on the inter-personal situations in the remaining 1083 occurrences of 19 derivatives. Some members of the field were eliminated at this stage, since they were only used in non-personal situations; others, like הָקֵד and רַחֲמִים, were never used in such situations. Many elements fell between these two extremes; e.g., almost half the occurrences of אָמַת, and slightly less than one-tenth of the occurrences of אֲמוּנָה, were in non-personal situations. The usage of these words in inter-personal situations showed considerable variation. For חָסַד and רַחֲמִים three out of every four occurrences referred to an action of God towards humans, the remaining one in every four referred to an action directed by one human party to another, and they were never used for an action directed by a human towards God; but approximately half the occurrences of אָמַת and of אֲמוּנָה referred to an action of God towards humans, approximately a third referred to actions between two human parties, and they were occasionally used for a human action towards God — for אָמַת one in twelve, and for אֲמוּנָה one in 16.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.*, p. 159.

<sup>12</sup> John F. A. Sawyer, ‘Root meanings in Hebrew,’ 1967 [*JSS* 12, pp. 37-50].

Thus, when their distributions were examined, contrasts as well as resemblances between the usage of **הָסֵד** and other members of the field became apparent. From this point onwards, a further 48 words, found fairly frequently in close proximity to one or other of the field members, were included — words like **בְּרִית** and the derivatives of **בָּחַר**, **יָשַׁע**, **חָשַׁק**, **יָשַׁר**, **טוֹב**, **צָדֵק**, **שָׁפֵט** and **זָנָה**. The collocations of members of the field with each other and with these additional words were counted and represented diagrammatically in order that the collocation patterns of the field members might be compared with each other. It was found that **הָסֵד** occurs in close proximity with **אֱמֶת** in 32 passages, with **אֱמוּנָה** in 15 passages, and with **טוֹב** in 23 passages; moreover, in each case the majority of collocations are in situations where God is the agent and the patient is human. Sometimes the collocates are corresponding members of parallel constructions, and in such cases conclusions may be drawn about the semantic relations between the words; the principles enunciated by Kaddari<sup>13</sup> provided useful guidelines in this area. Again, a string of words in collocation forms a frequently occurring expression which is known as a syntagm; thus, a variant of the expression **הָסֵד וְאֱמֶת** occurs in 22 passages, while on 40 occasions **הָסֵד** is the object of the verb **עָשָׂה** in expressions which use one of the prepositions **עַם** / **לְ** / **אֶת** to introduce the patient.

## 2. ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS OF **הָסֵד**

Attention has been drawn to the frequent collocation of **הָסֵד** with **אֱמֶת** and **אֱמוּנָה**. A careful analysis of the collocations made by different words showed that the tendencies of both **אֱמֶת** and **אֱמוּנָה** were very similar to those of **הָסֵד**. These two words occur more frequently than other members of the lexical field in parallel with **הָסֵד**: **אֱמוּנָה** 8 times and **אֱמֶת** 5 times. When several passages, including those containing these parallels, were examined they again underlined the very close semantic relationship between **הָסֵד** and each of the words, prompting the conclusion that **אֱמוּנָה** is an essential component of **הָסֵד** in a purely human situation (Proverbs 20: 6<sup>14</sup>) and also when Yahweh is the agent (Psalm 89: 50<sup>15</sup>).

<sup>13</sup> M. Z. Kaddari, 'A semantic approach to biblical parallelism,' 1973 [JJS 24, pp. 167-175].

<sup>14</sup> "Many a man claims to have unfailing love (**הָסֵד**), but a faithful (**אֱמוּנָה**) man who can find?"

<sup>15</sup> "O Lord, where is your former great love (**הָסֵד**), which in your faithfulness (**אֱמוּנָה**) you swore to David?"

Similarly, the regions of the semantic field occupied by חֶסֶד and אֱמֶת are extremely close, with considerable overlap, when they refer to human attributes; indeed, on one occasion אֱמֶת can be seen as an essential part of חֶסֶד in relationships between humans (Isaiah 16: 5<sup>16</sup>). Again, in a public confession of sin, חֶסֶד and אֱמֶת are both used with God as agent (Nehemiah 9: 32-33<sup>17</sup>); although the areas they cover in the semantic field are very close together, yet they are not identical. The rebellious people of Israel experienced hardships which were due retribution for their wickedness, and they acknowledge that God is both just and faithful in punishing them. Here אֱמֶת is more closely associated with the punishment of those who have rebelled against God, whereas the purpose of God's חֶסֶד is to produce human well-being: he allows them to suffer hardship but he desires to draw them back to himself and therefore he does not annihilate them — as they realise they deserve (verse 31<sup>18</sup>) — but he moderates the punishment thereby expressing his חֶסֶד to them in order to accomplish his purpose.

Thus אֱמוּנָה is an essential component of חֶסֶד when God is agent as well as when the agent is human, and אֱמֶת is very closely related to חֶסֶד in both types of situation but it is an essential part of חֶסֶד in relationships between human partners. Glueck expresses in many ways his perception that there is a very close link between חֶסֶד and אֱמֶת. He frequently uses the word "loyalty," but it is very difficult to decide whether he intends it as a rendering for חֶסֶד or for אֱמֶת. For example, when both agent and patient are human he says (p. 40, on Genesis 20: 13) that חֶסֶד is "not merely love . . . but . . . at the same time loyalty"; for, although חֶסֶד is used alone here, "one may still picture mentally אֱמֶת next to חֶסֶד." Again, when God is agent (p. 72, on Genesis 24: 47) the appearance of חֶסֶד together with אֱמֶת or אֱמוּנָה emphasises "the quality of loyalty inherent in the concept" חֶסֶד. On several occasions Glueck suggests that either חֶסֶד or אֱמֶת may be rendered by "loyalty."<sup>19</sup> He also claims that loyalty is

<sup>16</sup> "In love (חֶסֶד) a throne will be established; in faithfulness (אֱמֶת) a man will sit on it . . . ."

<sup>17</sup> "O our God, the great, mighty and awesome God, who keeps his covenant of love (חֶסֶד), do not let all this hardship seem trifling in your eyes — the hardship that has come upon us . . . . In all that had happened to us, you have been just; you have acted faithfully (אֱמֶת), while we did wrong."

<sup>18</sup> "But in your great mercy you did not put an end to them or abandon them, for you are a gracious and merciful God."

<sup>19</sup> See p. 50, on 2 Samuel 16: 17; p. 54, on 2 Samuel 2: 6; p. 57, on Hosea 4: 1; and p. 95, on Psalms 23: 6; 13: 6.

inherent in **חֶסֶד** (pp. 50, 72) and belongs to **חֶסֶד** (p. 102); **חֶסֶד** embraces **אַמֶּת** (p. 54), includes **אַמֶּת** (p. 55), and comprises **אַמֶּת** (p. 57). In addition, he says that “loyalty and love” are two of the “component parts of the general concept ” human **חֶסֶד** (p. 55).

The virtual disappearance from modern English versions of mercy words as a translation of **חֶסֶד** may be attributed to the pioneering study by Nelson Glueck. One of the objectives he set out to achieve in his doctoral dissertation was the recognition of the fact that **חֶסֶד** is not mercy. He states (p. 55): “In the older sources, the common usage of **חֶסֶד** never means an arbitrary demonstration of grace, kindness, favor or love.” His great contribution to our knowledge of **חֶסֶד** is his observation that **חֶסֶד** is done within a relationship. As he worked towards his goal, it is possible that he placed too much emphasis on the covenant relationship in which **חֶסֶד** so frequently occurs, thus leading some scholars to believe that the relationship always depends upon the existence of a covenant between the two parties. However, others believe that he left it so wide that it included almost any act that is appropriate to any human relationship involving rights and duties. An examination of a passage which contains several members of the lexical field, and tells of the establishment of the covenant relationship between Yahweh and Israel, may help to clarify the nature of the relationship which Glueck envisaged.

Deuteronomy 7: 6-13 describes Israel as Yahweh’s **עַם סֻּלָּה** : his precious, treasured possession; and here Yahweh is **הָאֵל הַנֶּאֱמָן** : the faithful God. Yahweh’s relationship commences in his deep yearning love (**חֶשֶׁק**) for Israel, a love which longs for a close attachment, expresses itself in a lasting devotion, and anticipates a like attachment and devotion from his people. Such love Yahweh exhibits by choosing Israel: he chooses (**בָּחַר**) them simply because of his love (**אַהֲבָה**) for them — not because of any special merit in them. Yahweh’s love continues as he remains faithful to their forefathers and to the promises he made to them, and leads to the establishment of the covenant relationship (**בְּרִית**) in which he expresses his **חֶסֶד** to the present generation — a relationship which places them under the obligation to love (**אַהֲבָה**) him and to obey him. The last two verses in this passage reiterate and summarise what has already been said, starting with the obedience of the people to their obligation: if they are faithful to Yahweh, he will be faithful to them and to the covenant, he will go on loving them and expressing that love by

fulfilling the promises he has made to their forefathers. This relationship which Yahweh has established and seeks to maintain with his people is founded securely on his love for them — a committed, enduring love. The covenant in which he formulates this relationship expresses his loving commitment to them — a commitment which persists even when it faces their unfaithfulness. It is, above all else, a covenant of love.

Similarly, the covenant between two humans — David and Jonathan — is also a covenant of love. 1 Samuel 18: 1-3 records the meeting of David and Jonathan shortly after David's defeat of Goliath, and of Jonathan's love for David on which the covenant between them is based. 1 Samuel 20: 1-17 is set against the background of Saul's jealous attempts to kill David (1 Samuel 18: 10-11; 19: 2, 10-18; 20: 3). Fearing for his life, David decides to absent himself from Saul's table and, reminding Jonathan of their solemn covenant (בְּרִית יְהוָה — 20: 8), asks him to bring news of Saul's reaction — describing Jonathan's response to his request as an act of הַסֵּד. David's reference to the covenant — based as it is on Jonathan's love for David — reinforces this request for הַסֵּד. Jonathan tells David how he intends to convey this information to him and, apparently sensing that it will not be good news, Jonathan also asks David to show הַסֵּד יְהוָה to him and his posterity (20: 14-15). Moreover, in making his request, he insists that David renew his vow in view of Jonathan's love for him (20: 17).

Both Glueck (pp. 46-48) and Sakenfeld (pp. 82-88) link these passages together, although 1 Samuel 18: 3 does not include the central word of their studies; but it is there — as Sakenfeld says on p. 83 — that the establishment of the בְּרִית between David and Jonathan is recorded. While discussing 1 Samuel 20: 8, Glueck refers to this passage in a footnote, to justify his statement that "David and Jonathan ... were already united by the bonds of friendship... ." He insists, however, that between them "there existed a sacred covenant concluded in the name of Yahweh" which "put both under the solemn obligation to take care of the welfare and safety of his friend." He also asserts that although the text is mutilated the meaning of 1 Samuel 20: 14-15 is clear — namely, Jonathan entreats David to preserve his life and that of his descendants.

Sakenfeld finds that both references to הַסֵּד in 1 Samuel 20 fit into the pattern which she has already discerned in the secular use of that word. David's reference to himself in verse 8 as עֲבָדִי "makes clear

that he is the subordinate party ... .” It is also clear that “although Jonathan would be humanly free to ignore David’s request, he is considered obligated by their **בְּרִית**. ” She summarises the content of verses 14-15 as Jonathan’s request for David to express his **חֶסֶד** by preserving Jonathan’s lineage when he comes to power. David is “the subordinate party in the existing relationship” but the expression of his **חֶסֶד** will occur in a “situation in which the actual roles will be reversed. David’s action will be the free act of a superior to an inferior performed in compliance with a specific political (and humanly personal) obligation.”

The summary statement above is in accordance with the facts outlined by both Glueck and Sakenfeld from these two incidents recorded in 1 Samuel 20. Their main interest is in the covenantal basis for an expression of **חֶסֶד**; and they find this in 1 Samuel 18, which Sakenfeld mentions in her introduction to these incidents. Referring to Moran,<sup>20</sup> she says “it appears probable that a political relationship rather than a purely personal friendship may be the intention of the narrator here” but she immediately adds that the “first meeting between the king’s son and an unknown young warrior hardly seems a likely occasion for entering into such a political pact.” Her emphasis, as she discusses the sequel (20: 14-15), is on the political rather than the personal obligation.

Glueck’s bond of friendship between David and Jonathan provides a more reasonable approach to the use of the word **בְּרִית** in this context. The **בְּרִית** here can hardly be a document drawn up in the correct legal manner to ensure that both parties are bound by the terms of their agreement and answerable to each other in case of default. This is not to deny that there is an agreement, moreover a binding agreement, recognised and accepted by both David and Jonathan; an agreement which possibly does not set out any specific terms and conditions — an agreement in which each accepts the obligation and the responsibility to take care of the welfare and the safety of the other. Such an agreement, in which each pledges his loyalty to the other, overcomes Sakenfeld’s objection that a political covenant is an unlikely outcome of the first meeting of the king’s son with the young unknown warrior. Yet even the word ‘loyalty’ carries political implications — at least in modern western civilisation, if not

<sup>20</sup> William L. Moran, ‘The Ancient Near Eastern background of the love of God in Deuteronomy,’ 1963 [*CBQ* 25] p. 82, n. 33.

in the ancient Near Eastern culture. Perhaps 'commitment' brings us closer to the essential element in the friendship of David and Jonathan; it is no casual friendship, but is from its very beginning a lasting, enduring friendship: a commitment to each other, in which each recognises — and intends to observe — his moral obligations to the other. And Yahweh is the witness to this commitment which, in 1 Samuel 20: 8, is called a **בְּרִית יְהוָה**.

The ancient Near Eastern treaties recovered from Hittite archives have increased our knowledge of the biblical covenants; but it is possible that this has placed an undue emphasis on the legal nature of the covenants and treaties. It is not wise to import all this background into every use of the word **בְּרִית** in the Old Testament. Nor is it legitimate to insist that every use of the **אהב** derivatives carries the full weight of political implications, even in the David — Jonathan pericope. It is claimed that the foregoing account of this covenant avoids weaknesses inherent in the treatments of both Glueck and Sakenfeld, who appear to have read more into the text than is necessary; at the same time it provides for the acts of **חֶסֶד** a context which is not as wide as Sakenfeld (p. 3) claims Glueck's relationship is, for "he left the impression that any relationship at all — except possibly that of an open enemy — could be one in which (secular) **חֶסֶד** was done by both parties."

### 3. THE SYNTAGM **עֲשֵׂה — — — עִם/לְ/אֵת**

Sakenfeld found that the type of relationship in which **חֶסֶד** is appropriate is not limited to a formal covenant. Her investigation of acts of **חֶסֶד** between human partners enabled her to set down (see pp. 24, 44, and 234) features which are "normally present in situations in which the word **חֶסֶד** is appropriate." These features are:

- \* the act makes provision for an essential need;
- \* the act is directed by a powerful party towards one who is weaker;
- \* the agent is free not to perform this act;
- \* the agent is the sole available source of assistance;
- \* the agent recognises his/her responsibility, which is based on some relationship with the other party.

One feature distinguishes the root **חסד** from the other roots whose derivatives are members of the lexical field. Whereas the verb forms of the other roots occur frequently, the verb form **חסד** is used in

only three passages<sup>21</sup> in the Hebrew Bible. The verb that is used most frequently with **הָסֵד** as object is **עָשָׂה**; in fact, there are 40 passages in which **הָסֵד** is the object of this verb, either alone or with another member of the field, and the patient is introduced by one of the prepositions listed in the heading of this section. Even-Shoshan's concordance<sup>22</sup> incorporates several special and unique features, including lists of collocates and of syntagms in which each entry word appears. **טוֹב** and **הָסֵד** are objects of **עָשָׂה** in almost the same number of passages, but only eight times is **טוֹב** followed by one of the prepositions. However, the verb **יָטַב**, which performs the same function in the sentence as expressions like **עָשָׂה טוֹב**, occurs 26 times with one or other of the prepositions. When attention was directed to these syntagms containing a member of the **טוֹב** family, it became apparent that they also satisfied Sakenfeld's criteria for **הָסֵד**. This raised the question whether **טוֹב** and **הָסֵד** were to be regarded as synonyms in these syntagms.

In Genesis 26: 28-29 Abimelech requests Isaac to enter into a treaty of peaceful coexistence with him. His good treatment (**עָשִׂינוּ עִמָּךְ כִּכְ-טוֹב**) was accorded to Isaac while he was living in Gerar, under the protection of Abimelech. In the first place, he forbade any of his subjects to touch (**הִנִּיחַ** — verse 11) Isaac and Rebecca, under penalty of death; and in the second place, realising that Yahweh was blessing Isaac, Abimelech requested him to move away (verse 16). Isaac's greeting to Abimelech (verse 27) makes it clear that he did not regard this request as a peaceful approach, thus indicating that the two parties involved did not see eye to eye in this incident. There is, therefore, an element of subjectivity — or relativity — in the determination of what is, or is not, **טוֹב**.

Abimelech's good deeds to Isaac had taken place while they were in the relationship of host and guest, where — according to the customs of that time and place — the host undertakes to secure the safety of his guest. Abimelech recognises his responsibility towards Isaac, accepts that responsibility willingly and freely, and persists in fulfilling his obligation even after he has become aware of Isaac's deception regarding his relationship with Rebecca. By ensuring Isaac's safety, Abimelech is performing an essential service which Isaac is unable to provide for himself. Moreover, Abimelech is the

<sup>21</sup> Two of these occurrences are in the parallel passages 2 Samuel 22: 26 and Psalm 18: 26.

<sup>22</sup> Abraham Even-Shoshan, *A New Concordance of the Bible*, Jerusalem, 1983.



more powerful party, the only one who is able to act in this way, yet he is free not to perform this service to his guest. Thus, in this incident the expression **עָשָׂה טוֹב עִם** satisfies all the criteria which Sakenfeld has laid down for the expression **עָשָׂה חֶסֶד עִם**; and consequently the criteria are inadequate, since they do not afford a means of distinguishing between **חֶסֶד** and **טוֹב**.

Indeed, this incident concerning Isaac and Abimelech has some features in common with the incidents between Abraham and Abimelech recorded in Genesis 20 — 21, but there are also several striking contrasts. There, Abimelech calls his beneficial treatment of Abraham **חֶסֶד**; but here his beneficial treatment of Isaac is called **טוֹב**. In the earlier incident, Abimelech was made aware of Yahweh's presence with and protection of Abraham but he nevertheless invited him to remain in his territory.<sup>23</sup> Abimelech's actions demonstrated a developing commitment to Abraham, seen initially as an awareness of his obligations towards the stranger in his territory but moving on to a deeper relationship which he sought to perpetuate by inviting Abraham to enter into a similar commitment to his host. Hence, underlying all Abimelech's treatment of Abraham was his commitment to the guest whom he had allowed to reside under his protection — a commitment which was eventually mutual and was made formal and ratified in a **בְּרִית** in which each partner recognised and accepted his obligation towards the other;<sup>24</sup> a commitment which was mutual and was intended to endure, like that between David and Jonathan.

Here, however, Abimelech urges Isaac to move away (Genesis 26: 16-17). While he knows that Isaac's prosperity is evidence of Yahweh's presence with him, Abimelech — like his subjects — envies Isaac and fears that he may lose some of his possessions and his power to Isaac. His actions are motivated by his own self-interest; he does not make any commitment to Isaac — indeed, envy, fear and self-interest do not provide any foundation for such a relationship which must be firmly based on mutual trust. The **בְּרִית** virtually draws boundaries between the two parties, to keep Isaac and Abimelech apart; it is better described as a treaty of mutual exclusion rather than as one of peaceful coexistence. In the absence of a deep

<sup>23</sup> Genesis 20, noting especially verse 15.

<sup>24</sup> See Genesis 21: 22 — 27; cf. verse 32.

personal commitment to each other, Abimelech correctly refrains from using the term **חֶסֶד** and substitutes the appropriate **טוֹב**.

Genesis 32 describes the return of Jacob, accompanied by his wives and children and his flocks and herds, to his homeland after his long sojourn with his mother's brother, Laban. He learns that his brother, Esau, is coming with four hundred men to meet him. Knowing what sort of reception he deserves, he makes appropriate preparations and then prays to Yahweh, the God of his fathers Abraham and Isaac, asking to be delivered from Esau. The writer puts into Jacob's mouth first the words **יֵטֵב עָם** in verses 10 and 13, where they refer to the future — what Yahweh has promised to do; and then in verse 11 the expression **עָשָׂה חֶסֶד וְאַמֶּת** referring to the past — what Yahweh has done, specifically in respect of the large family and the possessions with which he has returned. The content of the former expression is expanded in verse 13 with the reference to the theophany and to the promise Yahweh made to Jacob as he was departing from Canaan (Genesis 28: 10-15); that promise looks back to the original promises made to Abraham.<sup>25</sup> Because the succession from Abraham through Isaac to Jacob is about to be confirmed, and because both of the terms refer to the promised proliferation of their progeny, it is easy to assume that the two expressions are used here as synonyms; but it is necessary to look into the matter more closely before accepting this conclusion. First, however, the pertinent comments of Sakenfeld (pp. 93-97) on verses 10-13 are worthy of note; since her focus is on the word **חֶסֶד**, the use of the verb **יֵטֵב** does not come within the purview of her study.

Sakenfeld finds that the **חֶסֶד** which Yahweh shows to individuals in this and other passages "corresponds closely to that which has been described for human personal relationships" — which justifies the application of her criteria to passages in which Yahweh is agent. She lists features present in this passage: Jacob's need — the preservation of life, for himself as well as for members of his family and his retinue — is essential; "Yahweh is the obvious and presumably sole source of deliverance"; and she concludes that the "other central features of **חֶסֶד**, circumstantial dominance in a situation of need, freedom not to fulfill the need, and lack of other source of help for the suppliant, are all inherent in a human request for divine help." Besides causing Jacob to prosper and gain in wealth (which

<sup>25</sup> See, for example, Genesis 12: 2; 13: 14-17 and 22: 17.

she has found is “not normally a part of a הַסֵּד action”), Yahweh “has overcome the obstacles which Jacob could not handle.” She draws attention also to the relationship between Yahweh and Jacob, and presumes that the writer’s use of הַסֵּד in Jacob’s prayer “was appropriately based in the personal relationship which God himself established in the theophany to Jacob, in which God assumed responsibility for Jacob’s welfare. Jacob’s faithfulness within the relationship is reinforced by the immediate fact (which Jacob mentions) that Yahweh himself has commanded Jacob to go to the land where he will meet Esau and that Jacob is complying with the command.”

We have here an illustration of the perspicacious insights which are a feature of Sakenfeld’s examination of the texts; but we do not agree with all her conclusions. When we seek to determine the question of commitments in this passage, we first notice that the word אֱמֶת is used alongside הַסֵּד in verse 11. Attention has been drawn above to both אֱמֶת and אֱמוּנָה as essential components of הַסֵּד, and the occurrence of אֱמֶת here serves to focus attention on the faithfulness of Yahweh in his acts of הַסֵּד to which Jacob refers. Moreover, this faithfulness is not primarily to Yahweh’s nature or to his promises, nor is it to Abraham and Isaac to whom he made those original promises; it is to Jacob himself, and to the promises which Yahweh made to him as he departed from Canaan (Genesis 28: 13-15). The writer’s use of the compound expression is an acknowledgement of Yahweh’s commitment to Jacob which has been evident throughout his absence from his homeland. Because there is this commitment to the person who is the beneficiary, the word הַסֵּד is the appropriate term to use for the benefits which Jacob has already received. On the other hand, Jacob’s future is still uncertain — at least as far as Jacob himself is concerned, for he has yet to confront the brother who has threatened to kill him and who is approaching with a force large enough to accomplish this purpose. Jacob’s prayer is, as Sakenfeld (p. 94) correctly notes, virtually “a request for an additional act of הַסֵּד.” However, Jacob has already admitted that he is not worthy to receive the benefits which Yahweh has bestowed on him, and he doubts that he can expect Yahweh’s loyal commitment to continue; hence the writer uses the word יָטַב which is appropriate in these circumstances.

2 Samuel 2: 5-6 contains עָשָׂה syntagms with הַסֵּד and also with a member of the טוֹב family. The expression עָשָׂה הַסֵּד עִם has the men

of Jabesh-gilead as agent and Saul as patient; Yahweh is agent in the expression **עָשָׂה הָסֵד וְאַמֶּת עִם**, with the men of Jabesh as patient. With the expression **עָשָׂה טוֹבָה אֶת**, the agent is David and the men of Jabesh are again the patient. Thus, for each syntagm there is a different agent.

David has been accepted as king by the people of Judah, and he is aware of the activities of Abner and Ish-bosheth in Gilead (verses 8-11). He sends messengers to Jabesh-gilead, complimenting the men on their **הָסֵד** extended to Saul in their recovery of his body which they buried in Jabesh (1 Samuel 31: 11-13). Sakenfeld (pp. 40-42) has difficulties in fitting this incident into her patterns, especially in connection with the relationship between the persons involved, but she concludes that "the personal character of the ongoing political relationship is the important feature." The use of the term **הָסֵד**, she says, makes it clear that Saul's proper burial was a matter of great importance, and the term is appropriate because "the stealing of the bodies was clearly a difficult and risky task." She overlooks the fact that the men of Jabesh performed this task, placing their lives at risk, as an expression of their loyal commitment to Saul. Their allegiance to him can be traced back to the beginning of his reign, when Saul rallied the men of Israel to deliver Jabesh-gilead from the besieging Ammonites (1 Samuel 11: 1-11). This victory not only established Saul in the kingship (verses 12-15); it also ensured to him the esteem and loyalty of the men of Jabesh. David recognises their loyalty, and this provides his reason for sending the messengers — to encourage them to transfer their loyalty to him since he has been recognised as king by the men of Judah. Sakenfeld recognises (pp. 110-111) that this is the whole tenor of David's message, and she translates **אָעֲשֶׂה אִתְּכֶם הַטּוֹבָה הַזֹּאת** as 'I will make a treaty of friendship with you.' This may be quite an appropriate translation in this context, and Sakenfeld has valid reasons for adopting it.<sup>26</sup> Although David may wish to extend **הָסֵד** to the men of Jabesh, she asserts that he is not in a proper position to do so since he is formally in the camp of the enemy (an allusion to his taking refuge from Saul among the Philistines who refused to allow him to accompany them to the battle of Gilboa — see 1 Samuel 27: 1-7; 29: 1-11). The narrator neatly

<sup>26</sup> She quotes in support articles by William L. Moran, 'A note on the treaty terminology of the Sefire stelae,' 1963 (*JNES* 22, pp. 173-176) and Delbert R. Hillers, 'A note on some treaty terminology in the Old Testament,' 1964 (*BAOR* 176, pp. 46-47).

solves this problem, she says, by having David invoke Yahweh's **הָסֵד** on them. There is, however, an alternative solution — in terms of the loyalties of the men of Jabesh-gilead. Their past commitment was to Saul, and their act of **הָסֵד** reflects their commitment to Yahweh as well as to their divinely appointed ruler — hence David uses an appropriate expression as he invokes Yahweh's blessing on them. However, their present commitment is also to Saul and his descendants and, until they commit themselves in loyalty to David, any beneficent acts between him and them may be referred to by the word **טוֹבָה** but not by the word **הָסֵד**.

The preceding discussion has exposed a weakness in the method adopted by Sakenfeld. Her inductive study, in which she has analysed passages using the word **הָסֵד**, has enabled her to discover characteristic features of that word; but she has not considered whether these features are also characteristic of other words besides **הָסֵד**. To adapt a mathematical term, Sakenfeld has discovered features of **הָסֵד** which are necessary, but she has not attempted to investigate whether they are sufficient. Necessary features are essential to the object under discussion — a lexical item which does not possess the necessary features of **הָסֵד** cannot be a synonym of **הָסֵד**, but it does not follow that an item which does possess those features is in fact **הָסֵד**. This can only be determined by considering features that are sufficient, for an item which possesses the necessary features but does not possess the sufficient features cannot be a synonym of **הָסֵד**. The investigation of words which occur as a replacement for **הָסֵד** in certain syntagms has revealed that Sakenfeld's necessary conditions apply at least to members of the **טוֹב** family.

Further, a feature which is sufficient — sufficient at least to distinguish between **הָסֵד** and **טוֹב** — has been proposed: the existence of a personal commitment between the parties involved whenever **הָסֵד** is used. The development of this feature as the study progressed has been outlined in this article. It has been seen that **הָסֵד** refers to an act which one person/party performs for the benefit of another person/party, an act which is based in the mutual commitment between the former and the latter. It is precisely this basic characteristic of personal commitment between such parties when **הָסֵד**, but not when **טוֹב**, is used that has supplied a means of distinguishing these words from each other. Incidentally, the concept of personal commitment has also provided a satisfactory, and more economical, resolution of some of the problems which Sakenfeld encounters.

4. **דָּן** IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

To this point, this article has been concerned with a well-defined corpus — the Hebrew Bible. There is also another smaller, but also well-defined, body of literature in the same language. The documents found in caves on the north-western shores of the Dead Sea were written by people who were familiar with the Hebrew Bible, as is evidenced by the frequent allusions to, and quotations and echoes of, biblical passages. In this article, attention has been confined to four of the documents, viz. The Manual of Discipline (1QS), The Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH), The War Scroll (1QM) and The Damascus Document (CD). The text provided with Masoretic punctuation and prepared by Eduard Lohse<sup>27</sup> is the one on which this study is based.

A careful reading of these four texts has shown that the word **דָּן** occurs 50 times in them. The distribution and the collocations of the word in these documents have been examined, with a view to comparing them with those in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (hereafter referred to as BHS). When determining the agent and the patient, it was decided not to distinguish between leader and man<sup>28</sup> but to classify the persons involved as either God or Human. It was also noted whether a singular or a plural form of **דָּן** was used in each case. The results of this analysis are given in Table 1, where the agent is given at the head of the columns, and the documents are referred to by the symbols given in brackets above.

	GOD			HUMAN			TOTAL		
	S	P	T	S	P	T	S	P	T
1 QH	9	17	26	2	-	2	11	17	28
1 QS	2	7	9	5	1	6	7	8	15
1 QM	1	3	4				1	3	4
CD	2	-	2	1	-	1	3	-	3
TOTAL	14	27	41	8	1	9	22	28	50

TABLE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF **דָּן** IN DEAD SEA DOCUMENTS  
(S = Singular; P = Plural; T = Total)

The introduction of a factor of 5 brings to 250 the total number of occurrences of **דָּן** in the Dead Sea documents ( hereafter referred to

<sup>27</sup> Eduard Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran*, Darmstadt, 1964.

<sup>28</sup> See above, on p. 37. In one case — CD 13. 18 — it is possible that the patient may be a woman; but there are several lacunae in the text which make it difficult to make any decision with certainty.

as DSD). This is approximately equal to the 245 occurrences of דָּקָה in BHS, and makes it much easier to compare the distributions in the two sets of documents. The resulting figures are set out in Table 2.

	GOD			HUMAN			TOTAL		
	S	P	T	S	P	T	S	P	T
DSD	70	135	205	40	5	45	110	140	250
BHS	169	14	183	59	3	62	228	17	245

TABLE 2: DISTRIBUTION OF דָּקָה  
COMPARISON BETWEEN DSD AND BHS

In both sources, דָּקָה is used much more frequently with God as agent than with a human agent (82% in DSD; 75% in BHS). It was stated on p. 34 above that 123 references to the דָּקָה of God occur in the Psalms; this is 50.2% of the occurrences of דָּקָה in BHS. It is interesting to note in Table 1 that דָּקָה is used in 1QH 26 times with God as agent; and this is 52% of its total occurrences in DSD. The close resemblance in this respect between the Psalms and 1QH may possibly be attributed in part to the similarity of the content and the literary form of the two sets of documents. However, the sources contrast in their usage of plural forms of דָּקָה — 56% in DSD, but less than 7% in BHS; this is due to the much more frequent use of the plural in DSD when referring to the דָּקָה of God.

Tables 1 and 2 show that the distributions of דָּקָה in DSD and BHS afford examples of both similarities and contrasts; and this is true also of the collocates of דָּקָה in the two sources. In order to discover how דָּקָה in DSD fitted into the BHS field of דָּקָה, a record was made of the number of times each member of the BHS field was found in close proximity to דָּקָה. It soon became apparent that other words besides these often occurred near to דָּקָה, and the occurrences of these words were also counted. Before attempting to compare the collocates in the two sources, provision must be made for the fact that דָּקָה occurs in BHS much more frequently than it does in DSD. This will be done by determining the number of times each collocate would appear for every 100 occurrences of דָּקָה in the appropriate corpus and by tabulating this percentage adjacent to the number of collocations.

Table 3 contains words that have been found to collocate more than 20 times with דָּקָה in DSD and shows also the number of times each collocates with דָּקָה in BHS. Since אָמֵן occurs in DSD 54 times

in close proximity to **הָסֵד**, it would occur there 108 times if **הָסֵד** appeared 100 times; also, **אַמֶּת** collocates in BHS 36 times with **הָסֵד** which occurs 245 times, so that it occurs 14.7 times for each 100 occurrences of **הָסֵד** in BHS.

	DSD		BHS	
<b>אַמֶּת</b>	54	108%	36	14.7%
<b>מִשְׁפָּט</b>	42	84%	14	5.7%
<b>בְּרִית</b>	38	76%	14	5.7%
<b>קוֹדֶשׁ</b>	28	56%		
<b>צִדִּיק</b>	22	44%	7	2.9%
<b>רַחֲמִים</b>	21	42%	17	6.9%
<b>צִדְקָה</b>	21	42%	12	4.9%

TABLE 3: COLLOCATES OF **הָסֵד** IN DSD AND BHS

Table 3 omits two words which collate more than 10 times with **הָסֵד** in BHS; they are

<b>טוֹב</b>	6	10%	24	9.8%
<b>אַמוּנָה</b>	2	4%	16	6.5%

**קוֹדֶשׁ** is the only word in Table 3 which was not considered as a member of the BHS field of **הָסֵד**. Others which occur fairly frequently in DSD near to **הָסֵד** include **צוֹן** (16 times), **פֶּשַׁע** (15), **קְדוּשָׁה** (11), **סְלִיחָה** and **שִׁמְרָה** (each 10 times), **חֹק** (8) and **הַטָּאָה** (7). These, and possibly others also, will need to be considered in their relationships with **הָסֵד** in the BHS corpus before conclusions can be drawn about the nature of **הָסֵד** in the two bodies of literature.

Other distinctive features that have been noted are:

- 1) the expression **הָסֵד וְאַמֶּת**, which occurs 21 times in BHS, has been found only once in DSD;
- 2) **הָסֵד** is the object of the verb **עָשָׂה** only once in DSD, whereas this expression occurs 40 times in BHS.

What is the significance of the features that have been noted above? What light do they throw on the content of **הָסֵד** in DSD as compared with BHS? Why is the relative frequency of several collocates of **הָסֵד** so much greater in DSD than in BHS? Is there any evidence that the meaning and/or the usage of **הָסֵד** is different in the two sources? Is it possible that other members of the field have undergone a meaning-shift during the time that elapsed between the composition of the respective documents? These and other questions can not be answered until further investigations have been made



along the lines indicated above. It is hoped that a report on these researches will be forthcoming in the not-too-distant future.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Some distributional resemblances between חֶסֶד and רַחֲמִים have been noted briefly, and it has been seen that the distribution of חֶסֶד contrasts with those of אֱמֶת and אֲמוּנָה. חֶסֶד often has a very close semantic relationship with אֱמֶת and אֲמוּנָה; indeed, these latter have appeared as essential components of חֶסֶד and contribute the element of loyalty that is inherent in חֶסֶד. Discussion of expressions in which חֶסֶד replaces חֶסֶד has led to a more precise formulation of the characteristic features of situations in which חֶסֶד is expressed by one party to another.

No attempt has been made to provide a definition of חֶסֶד. Indeed, it is doubtful that it is possible to define a word which — as Rabbi Maurice Hazan pointed out in a recent conversation — includes an extremely wide range of activities: so wide, in fact, that the concept is very vague. Certainly there is no single word that can replace every occurrence of the word חֶסֶד in the Hebrew Bible. It is easier to state the circumstances in which an action named חֶסֶד can be performed, or to describe such an action, than it is to define the word. But it has been shown beyond doubt that an essential and necessary criterion is the existence of a deep enduring personal commitment between the one who performs a חֶסֶד act and the one who receives it. This was seen clearly by Sidney O. Hills almost 30 years ago when he wrote: “. . . in the very choice of another person, by initiating an entirely new relationship with him, . . . there is implied an unconditional, lifelong commitment to him and his need, a responsibility for him that can never be rejected on the grounds of his behaviour. This seems to me to be what חֶסֶד means in the OT.” More recently, Katharine Sakenfeld<sup>29</sup> has come very close to this when she defines human חֶסֶד as “a freely undertaken carrying through of an existing commitment to another who is now in a situation of need.”

חֶסֶד, then, is not merely an attitude or an emotion: it is an emotion which leads to an activity that is beneficial to the recipient. The relative status of the participants is never a feature of the חֶסֶד

<sup>29</sup> Katharine Doob Sakenfeld, *Faithfulness in Action: Loyalty in Biblical Perspective*, Philadelphia, 1985. The quotation is taken from p. 131. This is a most valuable sequel to her 1978 dissertation, even though it is less technical.

act which may be described as a beneficent action performed, in the context of a deep and enduring commitment between two persons or parties, by one who is able to render assistance to the needy party while he is in such circumstances that he is unable to help himself. This statement is based on evidence obtained while examining a lexical field in the Hebrew Bible; but it has been shown that a similar field in the Dead Sea Scrolls displays considerable differences from this one. Do these differences imply that the writers of the Scrolls and the biblical writers had a different understanding of the nature of

דָּקָה?

## THE BYBLOS SYLLABARY AND THE PROTO-ALPHABET

BY

BRIAN E. COLLESS

The ancient Phoenician city of Byblos (Gubla) was traditionally associated with writing, papyrus, and books; yet no papyrus manuscripts have survived in its ruins, only inscriptions on stone and on metal. The Byblian texts we possess at present are of two kinds: firstly, inscriptions in the Byblian dialect of Phoenician, using the Phoenician alphabet and dating from the Iron Age (1200 B.C.E. onwards) (Dunand 1945, *Byblia Grammata*, 139-157; Gibson 1982, 9-24, 93-100); secondly, from the Bronze Age (before 1200 B.C.E.), a small group of inscriptions on stone and metal, written in a pictographic script, which has been dubbed "pseudo-hieroglyphic", because its characters resemble Egyptian hieroglyphs (Dunand 1945, 71-121). This latter script was immediately seen to have far too many glyphs to be an alphabet, but not as many as the complex Egyptian and Mesopotamian writing systems, and so it was probably a simple syllabary. A possible analogy for it would thus be the Aegean Linear B syllabic script, which has less than a hundred symbols, most of which represent a consonant followed by a vowel (CV). Linear B clay tablets were deciphered as Greek texts by Michael Ventris and John Chadwick, in 1952, more than fifty years after the publication of the first inscription by Arthur Evans (in 1900).

Two attempts at deciphering the Byblian "pseudo-hieroglyphic" script were issued in the year after the texts were published: by Hrozný (1946), who had previously deciphered Hittite cuneiform, and by Dhorme (1946, and 1946-48) who was one of the decipherers of the Ugaritic cuneiform alphabet (which was deciphered immediately after publication of the clay tablets, in 1930). This time their results were deemed to be unsuccessful. Recently, after thirty-seven years of labour, a new attempt at decipherment has been published by George Mendenhall of Michigan (*The Syllabic Inscriptions of Byblos*, 1985). Reviewers have judged Mendenhall's solution to be a failure (Moran 1988, Izre'el 1988, Kaufman 1989), though it is acknowledged that there is no way to prove or disprove Mendenhall's

dechipherment. There is no "Rosetta Stone" (the bilingual text that supplied the key to Egyptian hieroglyphics), nor a "tripod tablet" (as in the case of Linear B, where depictions of three-legged cauldrons occurred with the reading *ti-ri-po-de*, and other confirmatory details); and the corpus of texts is too small, compared with Ugaritic literature, for any interpretation of them to be self-authenticating.

Mendenhall (9-17) describes his operating procedures in general terms. His presuppositions were: the language would be West Semitic, more specifically "archaic Canaanite"; the writing system would be a CV syllabary (CVC would be expressed by a "dead vowel" in the second syllable, with the reader simply ignoring the second vowel); it would have about 90 characters, if there were 30 consonants and 3 vowels (*a, i, u*), and in the event he reduced Dunand's total of 114 to 63, by recognizing graphic variants; the script was the forerunner of the alphabet. As a basis for the task, he did a consonant frequency count on a sample Ugaritic text and a Hebrew passage from Genesis, producing two tables of "consonant relative frequency". Here we should note that Mendenhall does not give us such a table for his own results, to let us see whether Byblian matches Ugaritic and Hebrew; but his index of signs (Appendix 2) shows that in his resultant scheme the number of instances of *š*, for example, is meagre and anomalous. I will seek to rectify this imbalance here, and at the conclusion of the present study I will offer a frequency table comparing my own results with Byblian Phoenician (10th century B.C.E) and "Proto-Sinaitic" Canaanite (15th century B.C.E.), as well as the Ugaritic and Hebrew data provided by Mendenhall.

The problem with comparing Ugaritic and Hebrew, with regard to consonant frequency, is that Hebrew has 22 "letters" and Ugaritic has 27 consonants, so the comparison table is somewhat untidy (Hebrew combines *š* and *ś*, for example). Note in passing that Mendenhall's Table 1, which deals with Ugaritic, has 27 consonants, with *z* appearing twice, as 23 and 26; the second of these must be *ž* or *ḏ*; on Table 2, which compares Ugaritic and Hebrew ("South Canaanite"), the second *z* is omitted, leaving only 26 consonants. In any case, Mendenhall assumed that the Byblian inventory of consonants would have a high number (closer to 30 than to 20), as in Ugaritic and also Arabic. Albright made a similar assumption about the original alphabet; he posited 27 letters on the basis of Ugaritic, but found only 23 (Albright 1966; cp. Colless 1988, 65). However,

my experience with the proto-alphabet makes me suspicious of this supposition. As far as I can see the West Semitic pictographic alphabet never had more than 23 letters (Colless 1988: 65; 1991:62). Accordingly, in reconsidering Mendenhall's conclusions I have worked on the assumption that no more than 22 consonants are represented in the Byblian syllabary, the same number (and indeed the same consonants) as in the alphabet in which all other Byblian texts are written, namely the Phoenician alphabet.

Mendenhall expected 26 consonants (see his table 3, which omits *ḫ*) but found that *ḡ* and *ṭ* were "not represented". For my part, I have proposed three signs for *ṭ*, and have left *ṣ* and *q* apparently unrepresented (see notes on *ṣ* and *q* below).

Mendenhall claims (10) that for the first thirty years he took a purely cryptographic approach, ignoring graphic similarities between Byblian signs and alphabetic letters, except in the case of *'ayin* ("eye") and *samek* ("pillar"), which he accepted as acrophonically indicating the syllables *'a* and *sa*. Nevertheless, he is convinced that the Byblian signary is the missing link between the Egyptian hieroglyphic system and the alphabet (Mendenhall, 18-31). Kaufman (1989, 85) asserts that it is only by proceeding on this assumption that progress is "likely to be made, if it can be made at all". That is essentially the procedure that will be followed here. Having explored the manifest relationship between proto-alphabetic pictographs and Egyptian hieroglyphs (Colless 1988, 33-52), I am in a position to test Mendenhall's results by my own findings. To my mind, Mendenhall's decipherment is largely correct, as regards the values he assigns to the symbols; but I have difficulty accepting one-third of his proposed identifications for the signs, and he only has suggestions for twenty-eight of his sixty-three (Mendenhall's Table 4, Acrophonic Syllables); and when he compares twenty-four of the Byblian signs with Egyptian hieroglyphs on the one hand and the Phoenician alphabet on the other (Mendenhall's Table 5, Comparative Forms), I have confidence in only nine of his identifications. Nevertheless, Mendenhall is surely right in affirming that the Egyptian hieroglyphs and the acrophonic principle lie behind the Byblian syllabary and the Canaanite pictographic alphabet. In what follows an attempt will be made to explore these connections thoroughly.

Mendenhall has not always explained his system adequately; for example, neither on his table of "Byblos syllabic characters" (19) nor in his "index of signs" (176) does he indicate that there is a distinct

graphic variant for *ru*, and the discussion of this point is hidden away in the commentary on text D (Mendenhall, 75). Furthermore, he has not related his findings to the "list and analysis of signs" provided by Dunand (88-115). Dunand's inventory of 114 characters has been drastically reduced by Mendenhall, and a clearer idea of how this reduction came about needs to be given. Accordingly, Mendenhall's findings will here be compared with Dunand's proposals for the various signs, and my own position will then be stated in each case.

The assumption will be that wherever possible an Egyptian hieroglyph was borrowed for each sign, as in the invention of the proto-alphabet (Colless 1988, 31); apparently this did not always happen, because sometimes a suitable hieroglyph was not available.

The syllables will be presented in the order of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet.

	<u>BYBLOS SYLLABARY</u>	<u>HIEROGLYPH</u>	<u>ALPHABET</u>
o	'a 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 'alpu ox	𐎗 F1	𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗
	'i 𐎗 𐎗 'iratu breast	𐎗 D 27	
	'u 𐎗 𐎗 'uznu ear		
B	ba 𐎗 𐎗 baytu house	𐎗 O1	𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗
	bi 𐎗 𐎗 bikītu weeping	𐎗 D9	
	bu 𐎗 𐎗 bunduru reed	𐎗 M17	
G	ga 𐎗 𐎗 gamlu boomerang	𐎗 T14	𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗
	gi		
	gu 𐎗 𐎗 gupnu vine	𐎗 M43	
D	da 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 daltu door	𐎗 O31	𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗
	di 𐎗 𐎗		
	du 𐎗 𐎗 dūdu jar	𐎗 W1,2	
H	ha 𐎗 𐎗 haykalu temple	𐎗 O15	
	hi 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 hillulu jubilation	𐎗 A28	𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗
	hu 𐎗 hudumu footstool		𐎗 𐎗 𐎗
W	wa 𐎗 𐎗 wawu hook		
	wi 𐎗 𐎗 wiru copper	𐎗 N34A	
	wu 𐎗 𐎗	𐎗 Z7	
Z	za 𐎗 𐎗 𐎗 zanabu tail	𐎗 F27	𐎗 𐎗 𐎗
	zi 𐎗 ziqquratu ziggurat, pyramid	𐎗 O24	
	zu 𐎗 zurufu arm	𐎗 D36	

	BYBLOS SYLLABARY			HIEROGLYPH	ALPHABET	
H	ha	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲	hazizu	rain-storm	𐎲 N4	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
	hi	𐎲 𐎲	hiwatu	life	𐎲 S34	
	hu	𐎲	hudšu	new moon	𐎲 N9	
H				hank	𐎲 V28	𐎲
T	ta	𐎲 𐎲	tābu	good	𐎲 F35	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
	ti	𐎲	tipsaru	scribe	𐎲 R20	
	tu	𐎲 𐎲	turru	knot	𐎲 V12	
Y	ya	𐎲 𐎲	yahidu	united	𐎲 S23	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
	yi	𐎲 𐎲	yimnu	right hand		
	yu					
K	ka	𐎲 𐎲	kappu	hand (wing?)	𐎲 D48	𐎲 𐎲
	ki	𐎲	kippatu	palm		𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
	ku	𐎲			𐎲 Z9	
L	la	𐎲 𐎲	laylu	night	𐎲 N2	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
	li	𐎲 𐎲			𐎲 Q4	
	lu	𐎲	lubnu	white	𐎲 D14	
M	m	𐎲 𐎲			𐎲 V19	
	ma	𐎲 𐎲	maggālu	sickle	𐎲 U1	
	mi	𐎲 𐎲	mizbahu	altar	𐎲 R1E	
	mi	𐎲 𐎲	mitru	rain	𐎲 N4	
	mu	𐎲 𐎲	mu	water	𐎲 N35	𐎲 𐎲
	mu	𐎲 𐎲	mulku	kingship	𐎲 M23	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
N	na	𐎲 𐎲	nahašu	snake	𐎲 I12	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
	ni	𐎲 𐎲	nighatu	tusk	𐎲 F18	
	nu	𐎲 𐎲	nūbtu	bee	𐎲 L2	
S	sa	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲	samaku	support	𐎲 R11	𐎲 𐎲
	si	𐎲 𐎲	sim'alu	left hand		
	su	𐎲	sukkatu	booth	𐎲 O22	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
c	ʿa	𐎲	ʿaynu	eye	𐎲 D4	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲
	ʿi	𐎲	ʿipipu	eyelid		
	ʿu	𐎲 𐎲	ʿušru	ten, tithe	𐎲 V20	
P	pa	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲	panu	face	𐎲 D145	
	pi	𐎲 𐎲	pilakku	spindle whorl		
	pu			mouth	𐎲 D21	𐎲 𐎲 𐎲

BYBLOS SYLLABARY				HIEROGLYPH ALPHABET	
Š	ša			bag Ø V33	8∞812
	ši				
	šu				
Q	qa			øŸ V24	ø1øøø
	qi				
	qu				
R	ra 4	ra'išu	head	ⓓ D1	ⓓ P49
	ri >>7	riḡlu	leg	Ÿ D56	
	ru 33	ruḡamu	vulture	Ÿ G14	
	ru 2	ruḡamu	vulture	ⓓ 82H4	
Š	ša w w	šādu	breast		ωξω w
	ši 0	šimšu	sun	ⓓ N51Q N6	
	šu x x	šubtu	rod, sceptre	Ÿ S44	
T	ta ΠΠΠ	tarašu	wine	Ÿ M43A	
	ti 2	tibbuttu	harp		
	tu †††	tu	signature	† Z11	+ X

'a (\*'alpu)

The ox hieroglyph (F1; Gardiner, 461) is operative here (Semitic 'alpu "ox"), as in the proto-alphabet (Colless 1988, 33), but there are no instances of a clear pictograph, as found among the Sinai examples. In fact the Byblos sign looks like a scorpion (Egp. hieroglyph L7; Gardiner, 478), as Dunand has noted (Dunand, 96, sign A21). The common Semitic word for "scorpion" is 'aqrab (Akd. *aqrabu*); Koehler (731a) suggests that it was originally 'aqrabu (with initial 'alep), from the root *qrb* "fight", and if this were correct, the scorpion sign may have been used for 'a in the Byblos syllabary, but 'alp "ox" had to be used for 'alep in the proto-alphabet, because the "scorpion" had by then (c.1600) become 'aqrabu (with initial 'ayin). Mendenhall (25, cp. his Table 5) speculates that "for some unknown reason" the Byblos sign (understood to be an ox head) "was assimilated to hieroglyphic sign V-7, that had no connection with the ox"; in fact V7 is a "loop of cord with the ends downward" (Gardiner, 522); this is invoked to explain the "legs" at the bottom of the figure, which are also a feature of the signs deciphered as 'i and 'u. However, it seems best to accept the glyph as an ox's head



with the neck included, and assume that the bottoms of the three signs *'a*, *'i*, *'u* have been assimilated to one another.

The sign appears as the 1 p. sg. prefix on verbs (see also *'i*): *'akawana* (D 21, 27), *'akayina* (C 3); *'atum* (A 6, 9) may be a verb or else 2 pl. pronoun "you"; *habu'a* (D 31) seems to be a form of the verb *bw'* "come" with the causative prefix *ba*.

*'i* (\**'iratu*)

The pictograph that Mendenhall deciphers as *'i* (an oval with two legs and a small vertical projection at the top) is seen by Dunand (109, sign F5) as a knot. For Mendenhall (20, Table 4, and 25-26, 45), it is an ox-head plus the numeral 1, hence *'ihidu* "one" (but Ugr. *'ahd*); this word actually occurs in Text D (line 6), and since this writing system seems to employ the signs as logograms as well as syllables, this identification is thereby somewhat weakened (but see *ba* below). Another possibility is \**'iratu* (Ugr. *'irt*, Akd. *irtu* or *iratu*) "breast", with the projecting tip of the oval as a nipple. The pictograph differs from the corresponding hieroglyph (D27, Gardiner, 453), which is a semicircle with the nipple at the bottom of the curve.

Examples of its use are *'ihidi* "one(ness)" (D 6), *'ilila* "pact" (D11, 14), *'ila* "god"? (B 6), *'ima* "if"? (D 40), *ma'ihudi* (D 14-15, cp. Hbr. *mə'od* "power"?), *li'imu* "people" (D 12); like *'a* it is a 1 p. sg. prefix to verbs, as in *'i'itu'uni* (D 1) from *'t* "come", and *'ibaligu* (C 12; see Mendenhall, 108).

*'u* (\**'uʒnu*)

The sign identified as *'u* by Mendenhall (19-20, Table 3 and 4, and 25-26) is an animal's head with two round ears protruding at the top; Mendenhall assumes that *'uʒnu* "ear" is the acrophonic agent, and this seems a satisfactory solution. However, Dunand (102, sign D9) classes it as a building rather than an animal, and he confidently equates it with hieroglyph V17, a herdsman's shelter made of papyrus (Gardiner, 523); certainly this has the requisite legs, but its two upper projections are rectangular rather than rounded. There is an Egyptian hieroglyph for the human ear (D18; Gardiner, 452), but the face hieroglyph also includes protruding ears (D2; Gardiner, 450), though these are on the sides, whereas the Byblos head has round ears on the top, like a lion or a mouse; they are not ox ears,

*pace* Mendenhall. Of the many possibilities I have tried (for example, Akd. *uṣummu* “reed thicket mouse”), the best seems to be \**uṣnu* “ear” (Akd. *uṣnu*, Arb. *ʾuḍn*, Ugr. *ʾuḍn*, Hbr. *ʾōṣen*), Mendenhall’s solution.

Instances of this sign are: *ʾuma* “whether”? (D 35, 37), *ʾubaru* “ally”? (D 15), *ʾuḥa* “brother(hood)?” (D 20), *ʾuyatata* “signs”? (D 24), *ḥakimiʾu* (D 11-12) 3 p. pl. verb with causative *ba* from *kmʾ* “bind”.

### ba (\**baytu*)

As in the proto-alphabet (Colless 1988, 33), the house pictograph applies here, with \**baytu* “house” (common Semitic) producing the syllable *ba*. Mendenhall (20, 24, 26) accepts this without question. As in the Sinai proto-alphabetic texts, the basic house sign is a square or rectangle (Colless 1990, fig. 1-5), having some resemblance to the Egyptian character (O1; Gardiner, 492, a rectangle with a gap in the middle of its base line). This occurs on Byblos stone texts G and A (if the rectangle in line 10 is not *da* but *ba*), and on spatula E; but because there is no opening in these rectangles, for the entrance to the house, Dunand (103, sign E4, and fig. 42) connects this form with the hieroglyph for *p* (Q3, a seat; Gardiner, 500). The alternative form (in texts C and D) is a square with one of its sides moving up to become a diagonal line, as on the Lachish bowl (Colless 1988, 58, inscription C.7, and cp. C.9), and in the Phoenician alphabet (Dunand, 100-101, sign D3, recognized as a house).

The word *baytu* “house” seems to occur in the texts, written out in full, with *i* (a dead vowel?) between *y* and *t* (C 4 *ba-yi-ta*, and C 9 *ba-yi-ti*). In proto-alphabetic inscriptions the house pictograph could function as a logogram (Colless 1988, 65; 1990, 17, inscription 07; 1991, inscription 02, Gezer sherd). In D 6 there is a rectangle (so Dunand’s drawing) that may function in this way, as *baytu*, the subject of the following verb *kawana*; but Mendenhall (44) reads this as *ta*.

The *ba* sign is used as the preposition *b-* “in” (see also *bi*): *banu* “among us” (D 5), *ba yili* “with offspring”? (C 4), *ba ḥiti*? (C 2, 15). It is found in the divine name Baʿal: *baʿilu* (D 1, 10, 19), *bali* (A 10, Mendenhall has *dali*). It appears in various forms of the verb *bwʾ* “come”: *baʾu* (D7) 3 p. pl., *bawaʾi* (D 39) verbal noun, *mubaʾi* (D 4-5) causative passive participle (cp. Hbr. *hopʾal* participle, *mūbāʾim*,

“brought in”, Gen. 43:18; Mendenhall has *ba'i*, participle). Note also *bayiti bariri* “pure house” (C 9).

### **bi** (\**bikîtu*)

The character recognized as *bi* is a horizontal arc with three rays pointing downwards. Mendenhall (26) has no explanation for the pictograph, though he mentions Dunand's idea that it is a tripod bowl or mortar (Dunand 102, signs E1 and E2; also 99, sign B12, which Mendenhall sees as simply a slight variant, with the arc having become more angular). There are two Egp. hieroglyphs with three “legs”: N8 (Gardiner, 486) is a circle depicting the sun, with three rays, denoting “sunshine”, and this suggests Akkadian *biršû* “shining”; secondly, D9 (Gardiner, 451) is an eye with flowing tears, hence “weep”, and this evokes Akkadian *bikîtu* “weeping”. The fact that the “weep” root (*bky*) is common Semitic, whereas *brš* “shine” is Akkadian only, favours the weeping eye interpretation. Note, however, that the Byblos syllabary has celestial body graphemes (*bu* moon, *ši* sun?) as well as eye signs (*a*, *i*, *lu*). In either case the pictogram would have been simplified by removing the upper arc (of the sun or the eye), but there are analogies for this (see *bu* and *hi*).

The sign functions as a preposition, *bi* “in” (see also *ba*): *bi mali* “in fullness” (C 5), *bi ha'ilali* (D3) causative verbal noun from *ʾl* “enter”; for other (problematic) examples see C 3, 11, 14, D 22, 32, 33 (tabulated by Mendenhall, 159).

### **bu** (\**bunduru*)

The proposed character for *bu* (Mendenhall, 19) is the one identified by Dunand (98, sign B8) as the hieroglyph for a flowering reed (M17; Gardiner, 481), which in its hieratic form has one line omitted (Dunand, fig. 42). A possible connection is found with Akkadian *bunduru* or *budduru*, which was anciently defined as *bilti ša qanê*, “yield of reeds” (von Soden, 135b, suggests “reed shoots”, but perhaps it means “reed flowers”).

The sign occurs in the names Buhura (A 1, 10) and Habula (C 1); in the verb *habu'a* (D 31); and in the repeated sequence *ʾubud-* (see *u*).

### **ga** (\**gamlu*)

In the proto-alphabet, G is a boomerang (Colless 1988, 33, 35); and the Byblian *ga* sign also comes from *gamlu* “boomerang” (Akd.,

Ugr.). The boomerang hieroglyph (T14 and T15; Gardiner, 513) is an obtuse angle with the upper line shorter than the lower; the *ga* sign likewise has a shorter arm on the left side, but its angle is acute. In Text A, a monumental form has lines of equal length, and it is drawn with double lines. Dunand (106-7, 112) distinguishes the latter (G14, among the undetermined objects) from E19 (adz? flail?), but Mendenhall (20, Table 4; and 173, Index) equates these two forms and connects them with “*ga-ma-lu*” (“throwstick?”). The simpler form also appears to be used either as a numeral (“1”?) or as a signature mark of witnesses, in Texts C, E, F (and B?).

The syllable *ga* occurs infrequently: *dagati* “fish”? (A 6, 8); *gadula* “great” (D31, the text has *du-ga-la*); *dugawi* “numerous”? (C 7).

### [gi]

No instance of *gi* has been found. (The possibility has been tried that the rainstorm sign identified as *ha* might go with *gišmu* “rain”, but *ha* remains the better choice.)

### gu

The rare sign identified as *gu* (Mendenhall 19, Table 3) is a pair of horizontal parallel lines bisected by a vertical line, which is bent at the top. Dunand (97-98, sign B7) sees it as the *scirpus* reed, the symbol of Upper Egypt, hieroglyph M23 (Gardiner, 482; cp. M26, sedge?, 483). But this hieroglyph (M23) is also used for “kingship”, and may lie behind one of the Byblian *mu* signs (see below). There is in fact no hieroglyph matching this sign exactly. Assuming that it is a simplification of some hieroglyph, other possibilities can be cited. Hieroglyph F50 (Gardiner, 467) is a combination of S29 (folded cloth, vertical) and F46 (intestine, horizontal), denoting “copy, write out” (cp. Akd. *gabaru* “a copy”). F47 (intestine; Gardiner, 466) could be connected with Ugaritic *gnn* “insides” (Gordon, 380, No. 599). F37 (back; Gardiner, 465) is a horizontal depiction of a backbone with four ribs (cp. Hbr. *gēw* and *gaw* “back”). Or perhaps it is a simplification of M43 (vine; Gardiner, 484) with the props omitted, going with \**gupnu* “vine” (Ugr. *gpn*, Hbr. *gepen*, *gapn*-, Arm. and Syr. *gūpnā*); the vine with props possibly lies behind the sign for *ta* (see below). Obviously the *gu* sign remains unclear, and to add to the confusion we may also note Hbr. *gōmē* “papyrus” (likewise of the sedge family), and recall that Greek *bublos* “papyrus” is the name

given to the city Gubla, from which these texts emanate; but the hypothesis that this *gu* sign was a symbol or logogram for the city seems to lead nowhere.

There are only two occurrences of *gu*: *ʾibaligu* (C12) 1 p. sg. verb; *guḫiti* "progeny" (D10-11).

### da (\*daltu)

The sign for *da* is a door, from *daltu* "door" (Akd. *daltu*, Hbr. *delet*, *dalt-*, Arm. *daltā*). Mendenhall (26) and Dunand (101, sign D5) recognize the connection with the door hieroglyph (O31; Gardiner, 496). This is the D of the proto-alphabet (Colless 1988, 35; 1990, 3-4), a view not shared by Mendenhall (26-27); he accepts that the door sign appears in the South Arabian alphabets, and that the Hebrew name Dalet and the Greek name Delta are connected with *daltu*; but he follows Albright (1966, fig. 1) in identifying the fish sign as D in the proto-alphabet; in my view the fish (*samk*) is S in the proto-alphabet (Colless 1988, 45-47). Mendenhall finds the origin of the triangular Dalet and Delta in the Byblian *du* sign, essentially an inverted triangle, which he takes to be a stylized fish; Greek and Phoenician D would thus represent a tailless fish. However, the Byblian sign is not a fish but a jar (see below, *du*); moreover, the Byblian door sign (*da*) is already moving towards a triangular shape in Text C, as in some of the Arabian scripts; and not all examples of Delta are triangles, many being the same as Roman D, which is closer to being a door than a fish (see Colless 1990, fig. 1, on D).

In one of its occurrences the door sign *da* produces a word *dagati* (A6, 8), possibly meaning "fish" (Hbr. *dāgāh*, collective noun). It also appears in *šaduda* (see *du*), and in the sequence *dašana* (D 14).

### di

The sign accepted by Mendenhall (19, 26) as *di*, is identified by him (without further explanation) as the "bolt" hieroglyph (O34; Gardiner, 496); Dunand (106, sign E18) had already shown that this character (a horizontal line cut by a pair of short vertical lines) resembles the hieratic rather than the hieroglyphic form of the bolt. None of the Semitic words meaning "bolt" start with *dī*, as far as I can see, but the syllable *dī* seems to fit the sign, nonetheless. Possibly the sign represents a breast-bone (Gibson 1978, 144b, relates Ugr. *dīʾy* to Arb. *daʾyu* "ribs of breast", and posits "breast-bone" as its

meaning, though he acknowledges, 117, n.6, that “pinion” is another possibility, from *d’y* “to fly”; so Gordon, 383b, “pinions”).

Of the few instances, we may profitably cite *la iḥidi* “to oneness” (D 6), *ma’ibudi* “power” (D15), *’ubudi* “servants?” (D 22, 27), where, however, *di* possibly represents *ṭṭi* (see *’u* below).

### du (\**dūdu*)

The syllable *du* seems to be represented by the inverted triangle with an acute angle (V) on top, a sign found only in Texts C and D. Mendenhall (27) relates it to *\*dugg-* “fish” (cp. notes on *da* above). However, Dunand (104, sign E10) regards it as an Egyptian unguent vase, with the two top strokes being the ends of the cord that ties the seal (Gardiner, 527, hieroglyph W1, sealed oil-jar with tied ends); this could be fruitfully connected with *dūdu* “jar” (Akd. *dūdu*, Ugr. *dd*, jar used for oil; Gordon 1965, 384). A similar character, more rounded than triangular, is suspected by Dunand (112-113, sign G15) as being a variant of this. Mendenhall (30) disregards this equation of signs E10 and G15, and has G15 as *qa* (*\*qaba’u*, cp. *quba’at* “cup”). This monumental form of the character (found only in Texts A and G) does not have the two tied ends at the top, and therefore corresponds to hieroglyph W2 (Gardiner, 527, determinative for “jar”, whereas W1 properly refers to oil and unguent).

Support for equating the two forms of *du* is provided by the word *šaduta* (not *šaqata*, Mendenhall, 113) in A 5, 8, 9, apparently meaning “income” or “harvest” (Akd. *šadduttu*), and possibly the same as *šaduda* (for *šadutta*) in C 12 and D 33. Other examples are *’ubudutu* “service” (D 17, 30), and the sequence *’ubudu* in C 7, twice, though *d* may stand for *ṭṭ* in these four cases (see *’u* below). See also *ga*.

### ha (\**haykalu*)

The sign identified as *ha* is a square with the right half of its baseline bent inwards and standing parallel with the vertical sides; Mendenhall confidently connects this with hieroglyph O4 (reed shelter, field house; Gardiner, 493). However, the opening is normally on the opposite side in this hieroglyph, and the Byblian sign relates rather to hieroglyph O15 (hall in palace or temple; Gardiner, 494; cp. Dunand, 100, sign D2), in which the opening is normally on the right side, not the left. The word *\*haykal* “palace” or “temple” (Sumerian *é-gal*, Akd. *ēkallu*, Ugr. and Phn. *hkl*, Arm. and Syr.

*hayklā'*, Hbr. *hēkāl*) suits the sign and the syllable *ha* admirably. (The sign for B in some proto-alphabetic inscriptions has the same form as the field-house hieroglyph, O4; Colless 1991: inscription 05, Lachish Bowl Sherd, and 30, Cylinder Seal.)

The syllable *ha* occurs frequently as a causative verbal prefix: *habu'a* "bring in" (D 31), *ha'ilali* "coming in with"? (D 3), *hakimi'u* "make binding" (D 11), *tubalidu* "give birth" (D 10), and so on. Note also the noun *hawatu* "word" (D 1), the particle *yahatu* "namely" (D 6, 9), the adjective *hararati* "desirable" (C 4), and the name Habula (C 1). It may also occur as 3 p. sg. pronominal suffix in *bi-maliha-m* "in her fulness" (C 5; Mendenhall, 101, "in their fullness"). The verb *yatuba'ibidu* "they pledge themselves" (D 23, and cp. D 2) contains *ha* and *hi*.

### hi (\**hillulu*)

The sign for *hi* is a person jubilating, as is H in the proto-alphabet (Colless 1988, 35-36). Mendenhall (27) compares it to hieroglyph A28 (man with both arms raised in joy; Gardiner, 445). Because the Byblian forms of the sign are very stylized, Dunand has missed the point and classed them as objects (Dunand, 109, sign F4; 112, signs G11 and G12). The root *hll* (as in *halleluyah*) seems to be the basis for the syllable *hi*, perhaps from \**hillulu* "jubilation" (cp. Hbr. *hillulīm* "festive jubilation").

In text B (5, 6) there seems to be an inverted version of this, comparable to the H in one of the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions (Colless 1990: inscription 35); Mendenhall (122, 125-126) sees it as a bee, and reads *nutakapila sanuta* ("we will be surety; further ..."); reading *hi* we get *hitakapila sabidi* ("it is guaranteed; witnesses...") followed by *'ila miku* "the god Miku", and two witness marks (see *ga*).

Other examples are: *zahiru ma bilini* (C9, Mendenhall, 105-106, 112, "shining hereto"?), the first word from *zhr* "shine" (see *za*), the second possibly from *hll* "shine" (cp. Hbr., Arb.); and *yatuba'ibidu* "they pledge themselves" (D 23). In the sequence *tahima mulakihya ma muba'i* (D 4-5; Mendenhall, 41-43) the *hi* seems intrusive, but if we reverse *hi* and *ya* we find *hima* "they" (cp. Hbr.), and the meaning becomes "... the boundary of my kingship, and they being brought in" (Mendenhall: "the ordinance of my kingship. Whoever (*mamu*) enters").

**hu** (\**hudumu*)

The sign hypothetically identified as *hu* is a square with its top left corner removed. Dunand's guess for it is a house with an upper room (Dunand, 100, sign D1), for which there is no Egyptian hieroglyph. Mendenhall (20 and 27) connects it with \**hudumu* "foot-stool" (Egp. *hdmw*, Ugr. *hdm*, Hbr. *hādōm*; see Gordon, 1965, 389b). Again there is no corresponding hieroglyph, though Mendenhall adduces Q1 (seat; Gardiner, 500), but the resemblance is slight. (O40, stairway, has too many steps, it seems, and the word for that would produce a syllable with initial *s*, Hbr. *sullām*, Phn. *słmt*, Akd. *simmiltu*.) Mendenhall's diffident suggestion that this is the origin of H in the Phoenician alphabet, and E in the Greek and Roman alphabets, seems an unnecessary hypothesis; E represents the arms and head of the jubilator (see *hi* above).

The *hu* sign functions as 3 p. sg. pronominal suffix: *bayitahu* "his house" (C4), *li'imuhu* "his people" (D12), *lahu* "to him"; and see C12 and D 34. If the sign were in fact a stairway and represented *su* (see above), then this suffix would correspond to Akd. *-šu*, Eblaite *-su*; but if *ha* in *maliba-m* (C 5) means "her" (Cp. Ugr., Hbr.), then the masculine suffix would surely be *hu*, not *su* (cp. *su* below). The 3 m. pl. suffix seems to be *humu* (C 6, 10). The sequence *bihi'i* (C 3, 14) is interpreted by Mendenhall (98, 111) as "in him" or "in her" (genitive after preposition), but note *lahu* above. Another example of the syllable is found in the name Buhura (A 1, 10).

**wa** (\**wawu*)

The sign for *wa* is similar to the hieroglyph F13 (Gardiner, 462), which depicts the horns of an ox, and which functions as an ideogram for *wpt* "brow", and phonetically for *wp*. Both Dunand (110, sign G1) and Mendenhall (27-28) see this as one possibility, though the Byblian sign is an inversion of this. Perhaps the Egyptian *wpt* supplies the syllable *wa*, given the paucity of West Semitic words with initial *w*. Mendenhall (27) supposes that the Phoenician letter Waw is an inverted form of the Byblian sign, with the shaft lengthened. This may well be the case, but in my view the W of the proto-alphabet was a circle on a stem (Colless 1988, 36-37), and the circle may have opened out to produce the Phoenician W, when the Q had lost its original top stroke and become simply a circle on a stem (Colless 1988, 49-50). Alphabetic W is commonly thought to



derive from *waw* "hook" (or the like), and Byblian *wa* may have the same connection. (It resembles the bottom end of the Egp. *was* sceptre, and this could supply the syllable *wa*; cp. notes on *pa* below.)

The sign occurs frequently in the verb *kawana* "be" (in texts A and D), but apparently never initially, and this means that *wa* "and" does not occur in the Byblian syllabic inscriptions, or so it would seem.; but see *wu* below). Other usages are *bawa'i* "entering" (D 39), *tutiwa'i* "moving to and fro"? (D 16).

### wi (\**wiru*)

The sign posited for *wi* (Mendenhall, 19, Table 3) appears to have two forms: in texts C and F it is an inverted triangle atop another triangle (Dunand, 105, sign E13, a double ax?), while in text A it is a narrow figure with projecting arms and legs (Dunand, 106, sign E16, a loom shuttle?). The first is presumably a stylized version of the second, which could well be a four-handled copper-ingot; the hieroglyph of a metal ingot (Gardiner, 490, N34) serves as an ideogram for "copper", and this suggests \**wiru* "copper" (Akd. *werū*) for the Byblos sign.

Occurrences of *wi* are: *wiṣubutam* "rent" (A 7, 9), cp. Akd. *wašṣābūtum* "rental" (von Soden, 1488); *dugawi* "numerous"? (C 7); *wiṣu* "there is"? (C 3).

### wu

For this syllable Mendenhall (19 and 177) has chosen, without comment, a figure resembling hieroglyph V1, a coil of rope (Gardiner, 521; cp. Dunand, 107, sign E20), found in text D (31, 38), C (7), and possibly I (8); he equates this with the sign in D 39 that has an additional stroke at the top (Dunand, 111, sign G5), and in fact he employs this as his regular character for transcribing *wu*. In text A (7, 8) there are some barely legible characters that may be *wu*, or else *yi* or *ʔi*. The sign seems to be more like hieroglyph Z7 (Gardiner, 537), a hieroglyphic adaptation of the hieratic abbreviated form of G43, a quail chick (Gardiner, 472), which functions as *w*. Could this hieroglyph have been borrowed for *wu* because a suitable Semitic word beginning with *wu* was not available? (Akkadian has *wurruqum*, "bright yellow"; cp. the colour of the chicken?).

The syllable *wu* appears in *yikiniwu* (D 38), derived by Mendenhall (90) from a root *knw*; *hawubu* (D 39) from *hwb* "sin"? (Mendenhall, 90-92); *ʔubuduwu* "service"? (C 7); and in D 31 (see *tu*).

In D 35-41 (Mendenhall, 85) we seem to have two long clauses each beginning with *'uma* "whether", and a third beginning with *'ima* "if"; in D 38 a sequence *wi ma* occurs, and in C 7 *wi ma* and *wu ma*. Is there any connection here with Eblaite *ù-ma* and Hbr. *wm* (conjunction with enclitic *ma*, "and indeed"; see Gordon 1987, 29-44)? These may be cases of *w* meaning "and" (see *wa* above, which is not attested as "and" in these texts).

### za (\**zanabu*)

The first question to ask is whether *z* and *d* are distinguished in the Byblian syllabary, as in the Ugaritic cuneiform alphabet and in the Arabian alphabets; the Akkadian syllabary and the Phoenician alphabet do not separate them (Colless 1988, 37-38). Starting from "the assumption that the number of consonants was analogous to that of Ugarit", Mendenhall (10, and 74-75) finds one sign for *zu* and another for *du* in the Byblian script, both of them rare and both found in line 28 of text D: *zu-ku-ta la + ki-ti + ma zu-ku-ta du*, "pure with respect to the covenant, and pure who ...". However, we would expect *za* here (Akd. *zakû* "pure"), and so it seems preferable to read this sign as *za*. Furthermore, the Aramaic cognate *dky* "pure" (and Arb. *dkey* "bright, intelligent") would require initial *d* for this word, and Mendenhall would then have two *du* signs on his hands. For Mendenhall there is no *zi* in these texts, and *za* occurs only in line 9 of text C, in the word *za-hi-ru* "shining" (which has initial *z* in its Arm. and Arb. cognates). In my view, Mendenhall's *za* (in C, 9) is a simplified variant of his *zu* (in D 28; properly *da*), and accordingly it functions as *za* and *da* alike. Both forms of *za* would represent an animal's tail and go with \**zanabu* "tail" (Hbr. *zānāb*, Arb. *danab*, Arm. *danbā* or *dūnbā*, Akd. *zibbatu*). The Egyptian hieroglyph for "tail" is quite different (F33; Gardiner, 465), but the Byblian sign resembles the hieroglyph for "skin, hide" (F27; Gardiner, 464), which includes a tail.

Mendenhall's opinion (28) that the Byblian *za* sign (as found in text C) became Phoenician Z is very tempting, but the Sinai proto-alphabetic Z is merely a pair of horizontal lines, with no vertical stroke joining them; even so, the Sinai character might still represent a tail (cp. Colless 1988, 38).

Note that Dunand (98, sign B10) suggests that the sign in D is a papyrus flower, and includes the other one among those which are

accepted below as *ni*; one form of the lotus hieroglyph, M83 (Buurman, 140) is remarkably similar to the sign in text D, including the curved stem, and this suggests *šūšan* "lotus"; but *za-ku-ta* "pure" seems preferable in text D, 29, rather than *šu-ku-ta* (?).

### zi (\**ziqquratu*)

It seems that the infrequent sign which Mendenhall (19, Table 3) has chosen for *ti*, could well be *zi*. It is a triangle with a horizontal line in the middle, found in text D (22 and 29), and possibly in line 5 of A, where the apex of a triangle is visible (Dunand, 72, fig. 26; cp. 108, sign E24). It resembles the pyramid hieroglyph (O24; Gardiner, 495), as noted by Dunand (109, sign F6). The word to go with it might be "ziggurat" (Akd. *ziqquratu*); a ziggurat is basically a step pyramid.

In its usages *zi* seems to be a relative pronoun (D 22, Mendenhall, 70; D 29, Mendenhall, 76-77), but so is *zu* (D28, Mendenhall, 75; C 14, Mendenhall, 111); it must therefore take case inflections. The use of *z* as a relative pronoun is peculiar to Byblian among Phoenician dialects (Segert 1976, 109); elsewhere *š* is normal. Mendenhall (70-71) also finds a relative pronoun *tu* (see *šu* below), in D 23.

### zu (\**zurū'u*)

The sign selected for *du* by Mendenhall (19, Table 3) is found once in text C (14) and twice in D (28, 34). Dunand (93, sign A13) equates it with the Egyptian hieroglyph for a human arm with its elbow and hand included (D36; Gardiner, 454; Dunand reproduces hieroglyph D37, with the hand holding an offering). Mendenhall (20, Table 4) ties it with *durū'u* "arm", and this seems a satisfactory approach. The cognates do not have *u* in the first syllable (Arb. *dirā'*, Hbr. *ṣērō'*, Arm. *dērā'*), but the word appears in the Amarna letters as *zu-ru-uh*, where the initial *zu* might represent *zə* (with shewa, as in the Hbr. and Arm. forms, though Huehnergard, 48, n. 2, reconstructs it as \**dorō'*). Did shewa exist in Bronze Age Canaanite?

The Byblian sign possibly acts as a logogram for "arm" in line 34 of text D (*zurū' ma-la-ki*, "arm of the king"?).

In D 28 and C 14, *zu* seems to be a relative pronoun, "who" (cp. Hbr. *zū*, Ugr. *d-* and *d-*, Arb. *du*); see also *zi* above.

Note that the same hieroglyph (D36) lies behind proto-alphabetic Y (*yad* "hand; Colless 1988, 42). Mendenhall (28) sees a connection

between Phoenician Yod and the shape of the Byblian sign he reads as *yu* (see *yu* and *si* below).

### ḥa (\*ḥaṣṣu)

Regarding the consonant *ḥ*, the basic question is whether the Byblos writing system distinguished *ḥ* and *ḥ*, as in the proto-alphabetic script of Sinai (Colless 1988, 38-41; 1990, 4), or combined them, as in the Phoenician and Hebrew alphabet. Mendenhall (19, Table 3) has Byblian signs for *ḥa*, *ḥi*, *ḥu*, and *ḥu*, but the last of these is very uncertain, and the evidence seems to point to no distinction being made between *ḥ* and *ḥ*. Mendenhall (68) comes close to accepting this when he tries to connect *ḥa* (in D 20) with Ugr. *ḥ* “brother-(hood)”; he admits that reversing the values (reading the *ḥa* sign as *ḥa*) “raises as many new problems as it solves”.

The sign for *ḥa* consists of four vertical lines joined at the top by a horizontal bar; it occurs in text D (8, 25, 39); the same inscription (20) has a similar character with six strokes, while text C (13, cp. text F, 2) has one with three strokes. The three signs may be variants of the four-stroke grapheme, as assumed by Mendenhall (174). Dunand (101, sign D6) proposes a connection with hieroglyph O27, a hall of columns (Gardiner, 495), with the four strokes representing two walls and two columns. For the three-stroke form, Dunand (102, sign D8) compares hieroglyph O22, an open booth supported by a pole (Gardiner, 495); if this sign is to be distinguished from the others it could go with Hebrew *sukkah* “booth” (see below, *su*). The six-stroke sign is seen by Dunand (101, sign D8) as a fence, and this view is applied to all three forms by Mendenhall (20, 28). Mendenhall (20, Table 4) supplies a mysterious *ḥayitu* “fence” as the acrophonic agent, in line with the interpretation of proto-alphabetic Ḥ proposed by Albright (1966, Fig. 1). Mendenhall (28) finds his Egyptian equivalent in hieroglyph O42 and O43, a fence outside a shrine (Gardiner, 497), which has a horizontal line at the bottom as well as the top. He asserts that this is the origin of the Proto-Sinaitic and Phoenician forms of the letter Het. However, the “fence” origin for Byblian *ḥa* or Canaanite *ḥ* seems to be a chimera; the proto-alphabetic sign appears to be a house with a courtyard, hence *ḥaṣir* “court, mansion” (Colless 1988, 40; 1990, 4). A source for the Byblian *ḥa* could be found in hieroglyph N4, moisture falling from the sky, determinative for dew, rain, and rain-storm (Gardiner, 485). This character is composed of the sky hieroglyph (N1; Gardiner,

485; cp. *la* below) and four vertical lines (either straight or wavy) emanating from it (Buurman, *Inventaire*, 147). Like the Byblian sign in text D, the hieroglyph can have four or six vertical lines (straight or wavy; for the vertical wavy line seemingly representing rain, see also sign *mi* below). The syllable *ha/ha* could derive from \**haxizū* “storm-cloud, thunder-storm” (Hbr. *ḥāziz*; cp. Arb. *ḥindīd*, Koehler, 286a; Ugr. *ḥdd* or *ḥḏḏ*, Gibson 1978, 147a).

In the example already cited, *’uḥa* (in D 20), cp. Ugr. *’uh* “brother-(hood)”, the sign would represent *ḥa*, but in *tiḥata* “under, instead of” (D 25) it would be *ḥa* (Ugr. *tht*). In the sequence *ta ḥa wu bu ma ta ḥu ba m* (D 38-39), the root *ḥwb* “sin” may be present, or else *hyb* “fail” (Arb. *ḥawba*. “famine”). In *ḥuḥaša* (D 8), if this is a single word, the first two consonants would both be the same, though by my calculations the *ḥa* sign has etymological *ḥ* and the *ḥu* sign has *ḥ*; Mendenhall (49) takes *ḥuḥaša* to be the name of a tribe, and connects it with *ḥšḥ* “desire”, metathesized; or it could well be a scribal error for *ḥušaḥa* (Akd. *ḥušaḥu* “need, famine”). There is an obscure instance in I 7 (Mendenhall, 134, 136). The case found in C 13 may be *su* rather than *ḥa*; see *su* below.

### ḥi (\**hiwatu*)

The sign chosen for *hi* by Mendenhall (19, Table 3) seems to fit, but uncertainty surrounds it. Its form is a T with a small V on top. Mendenhall (28) speculates that it produced the South Arabian letter Ḥ; that it represents a spindle (hieroglyph U34; Gardiner, 520); and that it signifies \**ḥitu* “yarn” (20, Table 4); he notes that Proto-Sinaitic Ḥ is a hank of thread (hieroglyph V28, phonetic value *ḥ*; Gardiner, 525), and I agree with him on this point (Colless 1988, 38-41); but the word for “yarn” has initial *ḥ* (Arb. *ḥayt*, Hbr. *ḥūt*), yet Mendenhall sees the sign as *hi*; however, as stated above (under *ḥa*), *ḥ* and *h* are apparently not distinguished in this script. Dunand (105, sign E14) relates the character to a cursive version of hieroglyph S42, a sceptre (Gardiner, 509), and this might suggest Ugaritic *ḥt* “sceptre”, Akd. *ḥattu*. If it is in fact a simplified hieroglyph, my preference is for the \**ankh* (S34; Gardiner, 508), which stands for “life”; the arc at the top may have been removed to avoid confusion with the *ta* sign (see *ta* below). The Semitic root with the meaning “to live” is *ḥwy/hyy/hyb*, and “life” is found in Ugaritic as *hyt*, and also in a plural form \**ḥiyyūma* (*ḥe-yu-ma*; Huehnergard, 124; cp. Hbr. *ḥayyim*). The Byblian word may have been \**hiwatu* or \**hiwu*.

In its usages the sign covers *hi* and *ḥi*. Representing *hi*: *taḥima* “boundary” (D 4), *’ihidi* “unity” (D 6), *ruḥimatu* “beloved” (C 1), *raḥimata* “damsel” (C 12), *ḥisanim* “stores” (A 2). For *ḥi*: *guḥiti* “offspring” (D 10-11), *luḥisa* “whisperer” (D 12). See also *ḥaḥituyi* in D 35 (Mendenhall, 86).

In C 2 and 15, *ba ḥiti* is understood by Mendenhall (96-97, 111) as “in fear” (Hbr. *ḥitt-*, Gen. 9:2, cp. *ḥittat* in Gen. 35:5); but it might be “in life”, ideogram with *-ti* to indicate the genitive sg. case.

### ḥu (\*ḥudšū)

The character identified as *ḥu* by Mendenhall (19, Table 3) is a rhombus (a diamond) bisected by a horizontal line. It is found frequently in texts D and I, perhaps too frequently in the latter case, ten times in nine short lines; possibly it is a variant of *ba* in text I, as proposed for another Byblian text (Dunand, 136; Albright 1936, 10), where it is made to yield *bgbl rb* “in Gubal (Byblos) chief...”; but text I is barely legible and quite incomprehensible. Dunand (111, sign G7) includes this character among the “indeterminate objects”. Possible hieroglyphs for connecting with it are X2 “loaf of bread” (Gardiner, 531), and N9 (Gardiner, 486); the latter is not a rhombus but a horizontally bisected circle (moon with its lower half obscured); nevertheless its meaning, “new-moon festival”, fits beautifully with West Semitic \**ḥudšū* “new moon (feast)”, Hbr. *ḥōdeš*; Ugr. *ḥdṯ*, (as a personal name transcribed in Babylonian cuneiform as *ḥudaši*, Huehnergard, 231; cp. *bym ḥdṯ* /bi yāmi ḥudṯi/ “on the day of the new moon”, Segert 1984, 129). The fact that the hieroglyph is said to belong to the 18th Dynasty (Gardiner, 486) could mean that this Byblian sign is no older than the 16th century.

The sign appears in the royal name *ḥurnu ba’ilu* (D 1, 10, 19); in *taḥubam* (D 39); and in *ḥuḥaša* (see *ḥa* above).

In the sequence *bi ’a ḥu sa pa yi* (D 33), if the preceding word *šaduda* means “harvest” (see *du* above), then perhaps we should see *ḥu* as a logogram, reverse two signs, and read *bi ḥudšū ’asapayi* “in the month of ingathering” (cp. Hbr. *ḥōdeš* “new moon” or “month”, and *’āsīp* “ingathering”).

### ṭa (ṭābu)

Mendenhall (28) concludes that neither the phoneme *ṭ* nor a counterpart to its alphabetic letter (a cross within a circle) are present

in the corpus. However, the sign that Mendenhall (80) analyses as a ligature of *mi* and *'i*, producing *ma'* (sic), could be accepted as *ta*. (The ligature *ma'* seems unlikely for this sign, given that in line 13 of text C this sign and the signs *ma-u* occur in the same phrase). One version of the character appears in text C (11) and D (32), and Dunand (108, sign E26) likewise reads it as an amalgam of two signs. The basic form is found elsewhere in text C (13): a circle on a stick with two crossbars; Dunand (108, sign F2) sees it as the Egyptian "life" (*'ankh*) hieroglyph; I have already equated this with *hi* (see above), and my choice here is the *nefer* hieroglyph, which denotes "good and beautiful" (F35; Gardiner, 465); this can be taken with Semitic *ṭābu*, also meaning "good and beautiful". The Byblian sign would be an inverted version of the hieroglyph, which is basically a circle (or oval) under a cross (often with two crossbars); proto-alphabetic *ṭ* is found as a circle and a cross joined side to side, while in the Phoenician alphabet the cross has apparently moved inside the circle (Colless 1988, 41-42; 1990, 4; 1991, 27).

In D 32 we have the phrase *bi ṭabudu sanubi tunibi*, "in the good work of making fruit flourish", in which *ṭabudu* possibly represents *ṭābt*, with two dead vowels, the construct state of *ṭābtu* "goodness" (Akd., "goodness" or "good deed"). The word *ṭabudu* also occurs in C 11. In C 13 the sign reappears in an obscure context (Mendenhall, 109).

### ṭi (\*ṭipsaru)

The sign offered here as *ṭi* is understood as *ta* by Mendenhall (19, 31); he compares it with one South Arabian form of the letter Ṣ. Dunand (99, sign B13) indicates that it occurs only in text D (6, 8, 16) and suggests an analogy in Minoan linear script for it. The Byblian sign has the appearance of a Y with an inverted V superimposed on its two branches, and it could be a simplification of the hieroglyph for Seshat, the goddess of writing (R20, Gardiner, 503); this suggests Akd. *ṭupšarratu* "female scribe"; or possibly Hbr. *ṭipsar* (or *ṭapsar*) "scribe".

In text D (6, 8) it occurs in the sequences *ṭiwarati* and *ṭiwarā*, and the context (of straying animals) suits a connection with Hbr. *ṭirāḥ* "stone enclosure", Syr. *ṭyārā* (m.) "sheepfold" or "herd". In D 16 and 19, again in conjunction with the idea of straying (*tu'i*, D 16, 18) we find *ṭiwa'i* and *ṭiwa'utu*, perhaps from *ṭwy* /*ṭwb* "go and return", "spin".

**tu** (\**ṭurru*)

For this syllable I diffidently propose the sign which Mendenhall (19, 64) accepts as *hu*. Dunand (95, sign A18) finds it represented in texts C (5, 8), D (16, 30, 31), I (2, twice, 6, 7), and J (3); Mendenhall (174) adds the character in B (7), which Dunand (112, sign G9) catalogues separately as an indeterminate object, but the others he interprets as an octopus.

The sign in question may represent a tied knot, to be compared with hieroglyph V12, a band of string or linen, determinative for “bind” (Gardiner, 523); a connection might then be made with Akd.*ṭurru* (Sumerian loanword) “band” or “knot”. It may be relevant to note that the proto-alphabetic *ṣ* was apparently a tied bag, relating to the root *ṣrr* “tie up” (Colless 1988, 48-49).

The possibility needs to be considered that *ṭ* and *ṣ* (together with *ḡ* and *ḡ*) are not distinguished in this script. Certainly I have had difficulty deciding whether this sign represents *tu* or *su*, or both.

Surveying its use we find in D 31: *bi ra ki tu wu ma du ga la*, which Mendenhall (78) interprets as “blessings” (*biraki*), life (*ḥuwu + ma*) greatly (*dugala*). If *bi* is the preposition “in”, then *raki* might go with Arb. *rikka* “weakness” or *riqq* “servitude”; the latter could be related to *ʿubudutu* “serving”, in the preceding line (D 30); the Arb. root *rakka* means “be feeble”, and *raqqa* basically means “be thin” (and moves on to “enslave”), while the verb *ṭawiya* means “hunger”, comparable to the *ṭuwu* of D 31; but if the sign represented the consonant *ṣ* here (not *ṭ*), then we might have *ṣuwuma* or *ṣawuma* “fasting” (Hbr. *šōm*, root *šwm*). The sequence *dugala* could mean “great”, an error for *gadula*.

In C 8 and D 16 we meet the same sequence *tu bu ba ta*, which might be referred to Akd. *ṭābu* (D *ṭu-ub-bu*, “make good”, “satisfy”); and if the preceding sign in both cases is not *yu* (as Mendenhall supposes) but *si*, then we could be in the presence of a causative doubled form (šD), *siṭububata* (Akd. “make good”, “make friendly”; von Soden, 1391). Then again, Akd. *ṣabābu* “flutter about” might be invoked, which seems to suit the “straying to and fro” context of D 16, but the meaning of C 8-9 remains unclear.

In C 5, where the idea of producing offspring seems to be in evidence (cp. *bi malīham* “in her fulness”), the noun *ṭulitati* (Mendenhall, 100, *ḥulitati* “progeny, root” *ḥld*) might be related to Hbr. *ṭāleh*, Arm. *ṭalyā*, *ṭalyātā*, “young” (a lamb, a child).



As for D 30, *tu tu 'u* is reminiscent of Akd. *ta'tu* "toll" or "thank offering (to a king or a god)". Or is it *sutu'u* (or *su'utu*), from *ys'* (Hbr.) or *wḏ'* (SArb., Biella, 142) "go out" (cp. Ethiopic *wāḏā* "gift", Biella, 143)?

### ya (\**yahidu*)

The character selected for *ya* (Mendenhall, 19) looks like Y, on a horizontal base, with an oblique line radiating down from each of its branches. Dunand (110, sign G3) points to its resemblance (fortuitous?) to the 18th-Dynasty hieratic form of hieroglyph S23 (Gardiner, 306), described by Gardiner as "knotted strips of cloth", denoting "unite". Hbr. *yḥd* (meaning "be united", and "unite" in the D stem) comes to mind here; but if this is a very old language, *wḥd* might have been expected, as in Arabic (*waḥada*, *yahidu*, "be alone", D stem "unite").

Mendenhall (28) says that the Proto-Sinaitic alphabet used an abbreviated form of this sign for Y; this statement makes no sense to me; proto-alphabetic Y (Colless 1988, 42; 1990, 4) is a hand and forearm, similar to hieroglyph D36, which seems to go with *zu* in the Byblian syllabary (see *zu* above).

In the texts, *ya* appears as 1 p. sg. pronom. suffix (D 4, 11, 40) and as a verbal prefix (D 2, 23, C 7); also in *yahatu* (see *ha* above).

### yi (\**yimnu*)

The *yi* sign is like an italic Y (Mendenhall, 19). Dunand (98, sign B11) finds it in all the complete texts except A, and thinks it might be a plant. Mendenhall (118) adds a similar character from text A (line 8); but he feels that "it is far from possible to say what it is supposed to represent". Could it be a simplified hand? Hand symbols seem to be used for *zu* and *ka*, and also a "left hand" (see *yu*); but this one would be a "right hand", Akd. *imnu*, "right (hand)", Ugr. *ymn*, though Hebrew (*yāmīn*), Arabic (*yamīn*), and Aramaic (*yammīnā*) have *ya* rather than *yi* (cp. also Yaman as the name for Yod in the Ethiopic alphabet). However, *yi* is found at Ebla, alongside *ya* (Fronzaroli 1984, 135: *a-me-nūm* /yamin-um/, *a-me-tum* /yamit-t-um/, *i-me-tum* /yimit-t-um/).

The *yi* sign seems to be used as a verbal prefix in *yikiniwu* (D 38) and *yiyi'ila* (D 37); *yibami* in D 18 and *yili* in C 4 are possibly nouns.

## [yu]

Mendenhall's proposed sign for *yu* is a character which Dunand (93, sign A14) and Mendenhall (19, 20, 24, 28) alike see as a hand, and which they connect with the Yod of the Phoenician alphabet. Mendenhall (20, 28) posits \**yudu* "hand", but admits that the vowel in *yu* is "surprising"; the word is only attested with *ya* (Hbr. *yād*, Arb. *yad*) or *yi* (Akd. *idu*, Eblaic *i-tim* /yid-/, Fronzaroli 1984, 144); the same problem was encountered with *zu* ("arm") above.

Given the infrequency of the syllable *yu* in Semitic, and the frequency of sibilant syllables, it might be better to move this sign into the missing *si* position (see below). The *ya* hand-sign is pointing to the right; this hand-sign is pointing to the left, and might therefore be referred to Akd. *šumēlu*, Hbr. *šəmo'el*, Arb. *šimāl* "left (hand)".

**ka** (\**kappu*)

The *ka* sign, which appears in most of the texts, could be described as a cross (multiplication sign) within an inverted V. Dunand (112, sign G13) puts it among his indeterminate objects, and he has its text B form under geometric figures (113, H3). Mendenhall (20, 24, 28-29) relates it to the proto-alphabetic K (Kaph) and to *kappu* "hand" ("palm with fingers"); this seems acceptable (cp. Colless 1988, 43-44), though Kaufman (85) is sceptical. Another possibility is \**kanapu* "wing", to go with hieroglyph H5 (Gardiner, 474). Nevertheless, the "palm" origin is much preferable for *ka* and K. I have elsewhere pointed to hieroglyph D46, hand with thumb (Gardiner, 455; and Buurman 1988, 96, for examples in which the four fingers are shown, not simply the thumb) as a counterpart to pictographic K (see tables of signs in Colless 1988, 1990, 1991); this suits two early examples from Canaan, which have the thumb (see Colless 1991: 01, Gezer jars; 03, Shechem plaque), but the Gezer sherd (Colless 1988, text C1; 1991, inscription 02, Gezer sherd) and some of the Sinai examples, notably texts 349 and 357 (Colless 1990, inscriptions 22 and 32), would go better with hieroglyph D48 "palm", "hand without thumb" (Gardiner, 456; and Buurman 1988, 96, for an example with the fingers shown). The Byblian sign is always stylized (even in its monumental form on text A), but it has four fingers and no thumb, so it is closer to hieroglyph D48 than to D46.

The sign occurs in the verb “be”, *kawana* (D 7), *kawanatum* (A 3), *kayinu* (B 3), *kayinatum* (C 6), and other forms; also in *hitakapila* (B 5), see *hi* above.

### ki (\*kippatu)

The sign identified as *ki* by Mendenhall (19, 29) also resembles a hand, with three stick fingers and a wrist. The fact that it occurs only in D suggests that it might be a variant of some other hand-sign found in the other texts. However, text D has all of these possibilities (*ka*, *yi*, *si*). Mendenhall (29) dismisses as “a purely accidental occurrence” this character’s resemblance to Phoenician K (Kaph), and he has no explanation for the pictograph and its syllable *ki*; but some of the proto-alphabetic forms of K are only stick figures, which many scholars interpret as a plant and as Š (see Colless 1988, 43); Mendenhall (30, 84, 117) even claims to find two instances of this in the Byblian texts, as *si* (in D 34 and A 6), but in all cases, alphabetic and syllabic, this seems to be a chimera. If, however, such proto-alphabetic K-characters proved to be not animal but vegetable (cp. Colless 1990, 4, on the letter K), then they and this Byblian *ki* sign might be connected with \**kippatu*, Hbr. *kippāh* (pl. *kappōt*), used in Leviticus 23:40 for “palm branches” for the feast of Booths (Sukkot). Dunand (97, sign B5) sees the Byblian sign as a plant with three branches.

Its most common usage is in *kiti* “truth”, Akd. *kittu* (in D 2, for example); also *malaki* “king” (D 34), *mulaki* “kingship” (D 4); and in the verbs *tisakiru* (D 12), *bakimi’u* (D 11), *baki’a* (D 2-3, 26); see also D 21, 31, 38.

### ku (\*kuritu)

For *ku* Mendenhall (19) has chosen, without explanation, the diagonal cross (multiplication sign). Dunand (113, sign H1) classes it as a geometrical figure. It corresponds to hieroglyph Z9, which denotes break, divide, cut off. Perhaps the inventor of the script had \**kuritu* “cutting off” (or \**kurrata* “be cut off”) in mind.

It is found in *zakuta* “pure” (D 28), and in *miku* (a divine name?) (B 7, F 5, I 5).

**la** (\**laylu*)

The strange character identified as *la* by Mendenhall (19, 29) might seem to give some support to a theory that the Byblian signs are artificial constructions of random lines. It has a counterpart in Minoan Linear B script (*jo*). Dunand (103, sign E6) compares it with the hoe hieroglyph, *mr* (U6, Gardiner, 516), but a more promising source for it can be found in hieroglyph N2 (Gardiner, 485), which depicts the sky (the horizontal line at the top) with a broken (?) *was* sceptre hanging from it (hence the zigzag vertical line on the Byblian counterpart); it represents “night”, and this evokes Semitic \**laylu* (Arb. *laylan*, Hbr. *layil*, Ugr. *ll*).

Mendenhall (29) speculates that this sign was simplified to alphabetic L. This is possible, though the letter’s name Lamed has always suggested a “goad” and the pictograph is therefore seen as a shepherd’s crook (Colless 1988, 44); but is it merely coincidental that the *was* sceptre (which is part of this hieroglyph) is also a pastoralist rod?

Its main use is as a preposition, *la* “to” (D 2, 6, 9); also *la* “not” (D 38). For examples of it in a medial position in words, see *ki* above; see also *li*.

**li** (\**litu*)

The sign recognized as *li* by Mendenhall (19) is compared by Dunand (103, sign E5) with the head-rest hieroglyph (Q4, Gardiner, 500). Possibly we can invoke Akd. *litu* “cheek”, as the part of the head that rests on the object. Or the pictograph may be a jaw and a neck.

Like *la*, the *li* sign functions as the preposition “to” (A 10, D 10, F 7). In D 11-12 it is found in *tali* “dependent”, *šilitati* “dominion”, *ilila* “pact”, *li’imu* “people”.

**lu** (\**lubnu*)

The sign for *lu* (Mendenhall, 19), as found in texts C and D, is basically a right angle with a diagonal line, resembling gallows. Dunand (109, sign F3) relates it to the hieroglyph for a support for divine images (R12, Gardiner, 502, standard for carrying religious symbols). My suggestion is hieroglyph D14, white of the eye (Gardiner, 451), to go with \**lubnu*, Hbr. *lōben* “white” (of eye or egg).

The sign occurs seldom: in the king's name, *ḥuru ba'ilu* (D 1, 10, 19), and in *luḥisa* "whisperer" (D 12); see also D 14 and C 13.

### m

Mendenhall (19, 91) has identified one sign which has no accompanying vowel, namely *m*; this provides final mimation for some words (nouns, and perhaps also verbs) in texts A, C, D; but in text I it seems to occur also as the first or second syllable in words (this text has bar lines apparently serving as word dividers). The sign could indicate nunation rather than mimation, but the Akd., Ugr., Hbr., and Phn. analogies suggest that it was *-m* rather than *-n*.

What the character represents pictographically is a mystery. Dunand (107, sign E22) says that it is identical with hieroglyph V19, "hobble for cattle" (Gardiner, 524), determinative for "stable" and "stall". Dunand also countenances the possibility that the sign represents the ground plan of an apsidial house (house with courtyard), which, incidentally, I see as the pictograph for proto-alphabetic Ḥ (Colless 1988, 40; 1990, 4). Perhaps this *m* sign is related to hieroglyph S25 (Gardiner, 506), some kind of garment, perhaps a skirt, apparently with a cord to tie it on (like an apron or a cloak); can we invoke Hbr. *māḡāh* "girdle" or *mā'il* "mantle (worn by the High Priest, and associated with the ephod)"?

Mendenhall has neglected to list its occurrences, in his index of signs; see Dunand, 107, sign E22.

### ma (\*maggālu)

The *ma* sign is interpreted by Mendenhall (19, 20) and Dunand (103, sign E7) as a sickle (hieroglyph U1, Gardiner, 516), cp. Hbr. *maggāl* "sickle", and this seems highly probable.

No other syllable occurs as frequently as *ma* in this corpus of texts. It functions as "and" (apparently enclitic, like Akd. *-ma*), in lieu of the regular *wa-* "and" of West and South Semitic; see *pa* below, which is also used for "and".

In D 32 it may be a logogram, *maggālu* "sickle", subject of the verb *habu'a* "bring in", in a context of harvesting (D 31-33); see further *ḥu* above.

### mi (\*miṭru, \*miṣḡahu)

The sign for *mi* in text D (Mendenhall, 19, 29, 67) is a vertical zigzag line; for Dunand (95, sign A20) it is a serpent (cp. *na* below);

but it possibly represents rain falling, hence \**miṭru* “rain”, Ugr. *mṭr*, Akd. *miṭru* (“watercourse”), Arm. *miṭrā*’, Hbr. *māṭār*, pl. cstr. *miṭrōt*, Arb. *maṭar*. The rain and dew hieroglyph, N4 (Gardiner, 485) has four vertical lines running down from a stylized sky, and it has been suggested above that this was used for *ḥa*. A variant form of this hieroglyph (Buurman, 147, N4) has four wavy lines for the rain; this may be the origin of the idea for the Byblian sign. Note that the water hieroglyph consisting of a horizontal wavy line (N35, Gardiner, 490) can sometimes be drawn vertically (cp. *mu* below).

In texts B, C, F, I, the sign deciphered as *mi* (Mendenhall, 19) is simply a vertical line with a horizontal line on top, for which Dunand (105-106, sign E15) proposes a potter’s wheel. It could, however, be a simplification of the rain hieroglyph (to differentiate *mi* from *ḥa*), though in text A it has a base, and invites comparison with hieroglyph R1 (Gardiner, 501), and especially R1E (Buurman, 171), an offering table; hence perhaps *mi* from \**miṣbaḥu* “altar”, Phn. *mṣbh*, Hbr. *miṣbaḥ* (cstr. state), Arm. *madbəḥā*’, Arb. *madbaḥ*.

The special form of *mi* found in text D (12, 14, 18) is not included in Mendenhall’s index; it occurs in the verb *hakimi’u*, in the uncertain sequence *lu mi ya*, and in *yibami*.

In at least one instance, *rutu mi-buhura* “claim from Buhura” (A 1), *mi* is the preposition *min* “from” (with *n* assimilated to *b*); Mendenhall (113), however, characterizes it as “an enclitic -*mi*”.

Another example is the name *miku* (B 7, F 5, I 5). For *’asamim* in A 2, see *sa* below.

### **mu** (\**mu*, \**mulku*)

Again we are confronted with alternative signs. In text D, *mu* is a wavy line, exactly like the water hieroglyph (cp. *mi* above). Akd. *mū* “water” immediately offers itself, though its Old Akkadian form was *mā’ū*, and it later became *māwū* and *māmū*; *māwū* is the Eblaite word (Fronzaroli 1984, 145), but Akd. *ma-wu* is translated as Canaanite *mu-mi* on a cuneiform lexical fragment from Aphek-Antipatris (Rainey 1976, 137; cp. *mm* as “waters” in my interpretation of the proto-alphabetic Shechem plaque, Colless 1991, 33-35, inscription 03), and this gives the required *mu* syllable. By contrast Hebrew has *mayim*, cstr. *mēmē*, and Ugaritic has *my* and *mym*. (See Dunand, 99, C2; Mendenhall, 24, 29.)

The other *mu* sign is a wide V bisected by a vertical line, which is bent at the top. Mendenhall (19, 20) relates it to \**murūḥa* “lance”, but

Dunand (98, sign B9) sees it as an Egyptian marsh reed, hieroglyph M22, "rush with shoots" (Gardiner, 482); my preference is for hieroglyph M23 (Gardiner, 482), even though this has two shoots on each side of the stem; phonetically this functioned as *sw*, but before the Middle Kingdom it had also come to signify *nsyt* "kingship"; for this we could try \**mulku* "kingship" (Ugr. *mlk*), which perhaps occurs as *mu-la-ki* in text D (line 4; see Mendenhall 41, 42). This sign occurs four times in text C (5, 6, 10, 14), and apparently also once in text B and four times in text I, in all five cases with the shoots much higher up the stem (Dunand 97, sign B6); it is even found once in text D (34), though Mendenhall (84) feels compelled to deny this and reads it as *ʕi*; however, it perhaps functions there as a determinative for "king", written after *ma-la-ki* ("of the king?").

The syllable *mu* occurs as a prefix on participles: *mubaʕi* (D 4); *muraʕa* (D 13), followed by *murui*, interpreted by Mendenhall (58) as "evil-doer of evil-doing".

In text C we have *binihumu* twice (6, 10): "their sons" or "between them"?

#### **na** (\**naḥašū*)

The sign for *na* is a snake, equivalent to hieroglyph I12, an erect cobra (Gardiner, 476; Dunand, 92, sign A10), connected by Mendenhall (19, 20 24, 29) with Semitic *naḥašū* "snake" (Hbr. *nāḥāš*, Ugr. *nhš*), and with proto-alphabetic N (see Colless 1988, 45), though the letter N goes with hieroglyph I10, "cobra in repose" (Gardiner, 476).

The syllable *na* occurs frequently in forms of *kawana* and *kayina* (see *ka* above).

#### **ni** (\**nighatu*)

This sign (Mendenhall, 19) is a curved line, similar to P in the Phoenician alphabet (Dunand, 111, sign G8). My suggestion is hieroglyph F18, an elephant tusk (Gardiner, 463), which is, however, depicted horizontally rather than vertically. My reconstruction \**nighatu* ("tusk") is based on Egp. *nhṯ* "tusk" (Gordon, 441, note on Ugr. and Hbr. *ngḥ* "gore").

The syllable *ni* appears as a suffix (D 2, 3a, 3b, 39), which may well be the 1 p. sg. pronom. suffix, and in three of these instances dative case rather than accusative. In D 7, *baʕuni nita* is supposed to mean "enter among us", with *nita* presumed to be "an oblique 1 pl.

suffixed pronoun" (Mendenhall, 47); cp. Akd. *niāti* "us" (Old Assyrian, dative as well as accusative)? In C 1, *niniti* is taken by Mendenhall (95) to be "my daughter" (cp. Hbr. *nīn* "offspring"). In C 7 (Mendenhall, 103-104) *nini* recurs, as a pronom. suffix?

### **nu** (\**nūbtu*)

The *nu* pictograph is a bee (Dunand, 91, signs A5-8), hieroglyph L2 (Gardiner, 477), to be associated with \**nūbtu* "bee" (Akd. *nūbtu*, Arb. *nūb*; cp. Ugr. *nbt* and Hbr. *nōpet* "honey"), as recognized by Mendenhall (19, 20). The sign that Mendenhall (122) reads as *nu* in B 5 and 6, is perhaps a form of *hi* (see *hi* above).

Examples of *nu* include *banu* "among us" (D 5), *sanubi* "fructifying" (D 32).

### **sa** (\**samaku*)

For *sa* Mendenhall (19, 20, 24, 29, 121) has chosen the sign that corresponds to the Egp. *djed* pillar (R11, Gardiner, 502; a symbol of enduring stability, and in my view a spinal column, cp. F41, vertebrae); Mendenhall suggests \**samaku* ("pillar" or "support-column") as the Semitic word to go with it. Dunand (96, sign B2; 97, sign B3; 106, sign E17) distinguishes the monumental version with three crossbars and the simpler form with two, but he relates them both to the *djed* pillar; his sign E17 seems to be merely a cross (in text D, line 17), and therefore presumably *tu*. Mendenhall (24, 29) sees this as another case where "the syllabic sign is virtually identical to the later alphabetic one", and where the name, in this case *samek*, has preserved the original meaning. However, S was a fish in the proto-alphabet (the word \**samak* meaning "fish" as well as "support"; Colless 1988, 45-47; 1990, 5), although on the Lachish dagger (Colless 1991, inscription 04) there is a sign equivalent to Byblian *sa* and Phoenician Samek, and this may be an alternative letter S.

The value *sa* produces such Semitic roots as: *str* "guard" (D 3, 17, 24, 26), *skr* "deliver up" (D12), *sbr* "be bright, hope?" (C 6, 10), where Hebrew has *s* (variant *š* in *sbr*); but also *lps* "whisper" (D 13) and *lbs* "clothe", where Hebrew has *š*. This syllable also seems to function as a causative prefix *sa*: *sanubi tunibi* (D 32) "making fruit flourish" (root *nwb* "be fruitful"), and possibly in *yatasa'ubudu* (C 7). The sequence that Mendenhall (114) reads as *hisanitim 'amisam* in A 2 can be emended (by removing the highly suspect *ti* and reversing the



position of two signs in the second word) to *ḥisanim ʿasamim*, “stores of granaries”, cp. Hbr. *ḥōsen* “store” and *ʿāsām* “granary”, both words having the consonant *s*. It thus appears that Byblian *sa* generally corresponds to Hbr. *s*, but sometimes to Hbr. *š*.

### si (\**simʿalu*)

For Mendenhall, who has no sign for *si*, this syllable remains unrepresented or undetected. However, as stated earlier under *yu*, the pictograph of a hand pointing leftwards could be the missing *si*: Akd. *šumīlu* “left hand” has as its cognates Ugr. *šmal*, Hbr. *šmōʿl*, Syr. *semmālā*, Arb. *šimāl*, and Old Canaanite *simʿal* (von Soden, 1271a).

The *bayuti* of D 26, which Mendenhall (73) interprets as “houses” then becomes *basiti* (cp. Hbr. *bōšet* “shame”?). For the reading *siṭububata* in D 16 (cp. C 8) see *ti* above.

### su

Mendenhall has nothing to offer for *su*, but there is possibly one instance: Dunand (102, sign D8) relates the four line figure in C 13 (and also F 2?) to hieroglyph O22 (Gardiner, 495), an open booth supported by a pole, and this brings to mind Hbr. *sukkāb* “booth”. Mendenhall (109) takes it to be a variant of *ḥa* (see above). It occurs in a sequence *li su pa ḥi* (D 13-14), which could be “for the family” (Ugr., Phn. *šph* “family”, Hbr. *mišpāḥāb*).

See also *ša*, *ši*, *šu*.

### ʿa (\**ʿaynu*)

The syllable *ʿa*, like the alphabetic letter *ʿayin* (Colless 1988, 47), is derived from \**ʿaynu* “eye” and hieroglyph D4 (Gardiner, 450; Dunand, 92, sign A12; Mendenhall, 20, 24, 29).

Strangely, this sign only occurs in text D, where it is to be distinguished from *ʿi* (represented by an eyelid, see below). In view of the cognates of Hbr. *ʿayin*, namely Akd. *ēnu* and *īnu*, and Ugr. *ʿn* (*ēnu*? Huehnergard, 159), and an Amarna Canaanite gloss *ḥinaya* “my eye” (Koehler-Baumgartner, 699b), and given that the Hbr. noun for eyelid has initial *ʿa* (see below), it is possible that the eye pictograph represents *ʿi* and the eyelid is *ʿa*. In Mendenhall’s opinion, Baʿal is found as *baʿilu* (D 1), perhaps representating *baʿlu*. In text A we find *bali*, with no *ʿayin* at all (see *ba*).

In D 25, in the phrase [*li*] *tali tiḥata tu'i*, "to be dependent instead of straying" (Mendenhall, 72), the preposition *tiḥata* would require the genitive case ending *-i*, and this supports the reading *tu'i* (with the eyelid as *'i* rather than *'a*).

In D 12-14, in the phrase *luḥisa ma mura'a muru'i*, "the whisperer and the evildoer of evil-doing" (Mendenhall, 57-58), the first two nouns (or participles) are in the accusative case (singular), as objects of the verb *tisakiru* ("hand over") in D 12, hence the ending *-a* is appropriate in each case; the third noun has the genitive case in *-i*.

'i (\*'ip'ipu)

This character is regarded by Dunand (105, sign E11) as a Nubian bow, and by Mendenhall (21) as "an artificial differentiation from the 'eye' sign". In my view it actually represents an eyelid with the eyelashes omitted, hence \*'ip'ipu "eyelid" (Ugr. *p'p*, Hbr. *ap'ap-payim*). There is no Egp. hieroglyph for eyelid. For another part of the eye see *lu* above.

Support for this sign as *'i* seems to be found in text D, line 13, in the phrase *mura'a muru'i* "evildoer of evil-doing" (see further *'a* above).

'u (\*'uṣru)

The sign posited as *'u* by Mendenhall (19, 20) is a rounded arch, which Dunand (107, sign E23) sees as either architectural or else as hieroglyph V20 (Gardiner, 524), which is V19 without the horizontal stroke (see *m* above), and which also functions as *mdw* "10"; accordingly, Mendenhall (20) relates the Byblian sign to \*'uṣiru "ten". The *u* vowel is surprising, in view of Akd. *eṣru*, Hbr. *ēṣer*, Arb. *aṣr* "ten"; but Arb. *uṣr* "a tenth, a tithe" could perhaps be invoked.

This is the only *'ayin* syllable found in text C, and in most of its occurrences in C and D it is in the sequence *'ubudu* "serve" (C 7, twice, C 8, D 17, 20, 22, 27, 30); but perhaps we have here a counterpart to Akd. *ubuttu* "ein Schuldgebundener" (von Soden, 1400), connected with Hbr. *bṭ* "pledge"; note the idea of "pledging" (*'bd*) alongside *'ubudi* in D 22-23. In D 27 *'uma* is possibly "people".

Text A has no examples of *'a* or *'i*, and its *'u* sign, in *'u ha mi na ta* (A 7) might be a logogram for "10" or "tithe". Similarly, in D 29, it

might stand for *ʿuṣr*, and *ʿuṣr-ʿu-ni* could mean “pay me a tithe” (cp. Old SArb., Biella, 386).

### pa (\**panu*)

The *pa* sign is very peculiar. Dunand (110-111, sign G4) tries the Egp. *was* sceptre (S40, Gardiner, 509), and we could toy with the idea that it stands for *wa*, and was used for “and”; but *pa* serves the same copula function, and the base of this sign is quite unlike that of the *was* sceptre (which has the same shape as the *wa* sign; see *wa* above). Dunand (111) decides that it is a plant, but Mendenhall (19, 24, 29-30) rejects this as “sheer speculation”, though he himself (without knowing what it represents) speculates that it was simplified into the Phoenician P; but in my estimation, alphabetic P comes from the pictograph of a mouth, *pu* “mouth” (Colless 1988, 47-48; 1990, 5). My view of this *pa* sign, looking at the monumental examples at the beginning of lines 5, 6, 7 of text A, identifies it as the profile of a face, with eye, eyelashes, and nose, hence *panu* “face” (Akd. *pānu*, Ugr. *pnm*, Hbr. *pānīm*); hieroglyph D19 (Gardiner, 452) is more detailed and has no projections, but D145 (Buurman, 90) is closer to the Byblian depiction.

In its usages, *pa* is predominantly a conjunction preceding verbs, meaning “and so” (D 3, 7, 12; C 8, 11). In A 6 and 8, *pa dagati* might mean “and fish” (see *da*); in A7 and 9, *pa wiṣubutum* could be “and rental” (see *wi*). See also *su* and *hu* above.

### pi (\**pilakku*)

The *pi* sign is a horizontal line atop a circle. Mendenhall (19, 20) identifies it as *pi* but does not discuss it, merely saying that it is the *pu* sign with a “diacritical mark”. Dunand (102-103, sign E3) compares it with hieroglyph W24 (Gardiner, 530-531), “bowl” or “pot”; perhaps cp. Hbr. *pārūr* “pot” or *pak* “flask”. My suggestion is *\*pilakku* “spindle whorl”, Akd. and Ugr. *pilakku*, Hbr. *pelek*.

Of its six occurrences, note *halipi* (D 36), derived by Mendenhall (86) from *lp* “beat”; *lapi* “in accordance with” (B3), cp. Hbr. *ʿal pī* (Mendenhall, 125); *hitakapila* (B 5), see *hi* above (Mendenhall, 125, has it as *nutakappila*).

## [pu]

Mendenhall (19, 20, 24, 30) takes the circle sign as *pu* "mouth" (a mouth saying "pu"; but Dunand, 94, A17, "la pupille de l'œil"). This adds about eighteen more cases of *p* to the inventory, putting this consonant higher on the frequency table than might be expected, in the top twelve, whereas it is one of the least frequent letters in the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions (Colless 1990, 5). If we accept the circle as the sun (*šmš*), we increase the number of sibilant signs, which are strangely underrepresented in Mendenhall's scheme. See *ši* below.

## š

Mendenhall (19, 24, 30) has signs for *ša*, *ši*, *šu*. For *ša* he has a supposed scimitar; but his example in F 5 could simply be a variant of *la* (cp. the clear instances of *la* in F 2, 3); and the sign in I 8 is a reversed form, and could also be understood as *la* (and the only case of *la* in text I).

His *ši* is a "sprout", allegedly found in A 6 (but this is a variant of *du*, with a scratch on either side; see *du* above) and D 34 (but this is a *mu*, representing *mulk* "kingship"; see *ki* and *mu* above).

For *šu* Mendenhall has a sign found by Dunand (108, sign E25) in B 2 and E 1. Mendenhall does not discuss this character, but in his notes on D 40 (92), he seems to find another case, without raising the possibility that it is *šu*. Occam's razor could shape it into a variant of *za* (the rear of an animal, with a tail, pointing to *zanab* "tail"); in fact, Mendenhall (124) notes this resemblance. However, it could be related to hieroglyph S36, "shade", depicting a sunshade as a semicircle on a vertical line (Gardiner, 508); in this case we could invoke Akd. *šillu*, Hbr. *šēl*, Ugr. *šl*, Arb. *šill*, Jewish Arm. *ṭālālā* "shade"; the appearance of *z*, *š*, and *ṭ* in this list serves as a reminder of the difficulty of deciding whether to accept *tu* or *šu* or both for the knot sign (see *tu* above). If the infrequent consonants *ṭ* and *š* were not distinguished in the Byblian script, then this *šu* is superfluous, since signs have already been tentatively identified for *ta*, *ti*, *tu*, and so some other possibility will have to be found for *yilašu* in B 2 (Mendenhall, 124, "they make binding", cp. Arb. *lašša*) and the other example in E 1 (Mendenhall, 127, has *rabašuti* "governorship").

Alternatively, we could divide the four signs evenly between *ṭ* and *š*; with the "shade" as *ši*, and the "knot" as *ša* or *šu*; but the correct solution remains elusive.

## q

The consonant *q* is as infrequent as *t* and *s* in Canaanite, and Mendenhall (19, 20, 24, 30-31) offers a sign for *qa* only, but to my mind this is in fact a variant of *du*.

We might expect that if no *q* sign existed in this writing system, then there would be some examples of words containing *k*, which could be shown to have *q* instead of *k* in later Phoenician or Hebrew. But I can offer no such cases; nor can I find an example under *g*. It is possible that this rare consonant simply did not occur in the few texts at our disposal, and the signs employed for *qa*, *qi*, *qu* therefore remain unknown to us. In the proto-alphabet, Q was a line (cp. Hbr. *qaw*) wound on a stick (Colless 1988, 49-50).

ra (\**ra'isū*)

Dunand (94, sign A16) recognizes that a counterpart to Phoenician R (*resh*) appears in the Byblian syllabary. Mendenhall (19, 20, 24, 31) agrees, and relates it to \**ra'isū*; he notes that it is highly stylized, as compared with the pictographs of Sinai and Canaan (cp. Colless 1988, 50), though the explanation for this is that the proto-alphabet made a new start with the letters; and originally the Byblian head sign must have been more pictographic, and comparable to hieroglyph D1 (Gardiner, 449-450).

Examples of *ra* occur in *tiwarati* (D 6, see *ti* above), *mura'a* "evildoer" (D 13), *hararati* "desirable" (C 4), and in the name Buhura (A 1).

ri (\**riglu*)

This is an infrequent sign, an acute angle, which Dunand (114, sign H5) classes simply as a geometric figure. Mendenhall (19) identifies it as *ri* but has nothing to say about its origin. It seems to be a leg bent at the knee (cp. hieroglyph D56, Gardiner, 457), representing *riglu* "leg, foot" (Ugr. *riglu*, Arm. *riglā'*, Arb. *rijl*, but Hbr. *regel*, *raglayim*).

As an example, note *bariri* "pure" (C 9). The other cases (in F and I) are obscure.

ru (\**ruḥamu*)

The sign proposed for *ru* by Mendenhall (19, 20) represents a bird, understood by Mendenhall as \**ruḥamu* "vulture", though the syl-

lable *ru* is not found in the cognates: Hbr. *rāḥām*, Arb. *raḥam*. Mendenhall (75, 115) has observed that there is a distinct graphic variant for *ru*, namely “an elongated s-curve”, appearing in D 20 in the sequence *ya-ru-ni* (cp. its full pictograph in the same sequence in D 28-29), also in D 17, and in A 4 (and apparently in A7, A9) together with the clear bird in A 1 and A 8; he regards it as an example of a “cursive linear form” alongside its “monumental pictographic form”; but the difference really goes back to the Egyptian hieroglyphic system, where G14 “vulture” (Gardiner, 469) has a variant H4 “head of vulture” (Gardiner, 474), both standing for phonetic *nr*. Dunand (90-91, signs A1-A4) goes too far in distinguishing four bird signs, only one of which (A4) is the vulture; and the vulture head is catalogued as two different entities (95, sign A19, serpent; 104, sign E9, hook).

Other instances of *ru* are *rutu* “claim” (A 1), *tisatiru* “they guard” (D 3), *murru* “evildoing” (D 13).

### ša

Mendenhall (19) has three *š* signs alongside one *š* character. Dunand (93-94, sign A 15) observes that this form appears in Phoenician, South Arabian, and Proto-Sinaitic alphabetic texts, adding that acrophony and its shape caused it to be called *šīn* “tooth”. Mendenhall (20) accepts it as *ša* and posits \**šannu* “tooth”, but then (31) casts doubt on it, because “this word normally would have been pronounced with *s* not *š* in this dialect”.

In the Phoenician alphabet, as in the Byblian syllabary, this sign is angular and jagged, whereas the proto-alphabetic form is more curved and rounded. In either case it could be seen as human breasts and related to Hbr. *šād*, Ugr. *td* “breast”.

However, I have elsewhere suggested a connection with one of the hieroglyphs for “sun”, with the uraeus serpent guarding the sun disk (N6, Gardiner, 486); in this case the sun disk has been removed to simplify the proto-alphabetic sign (Colless 1988, 50-51; 1990, 5). But in the Byblian system the circle sign may represent the sun (see *šī* below).

Examples of *ša* are not plentiful. On *šaduta* (A 5) and *šaduda* (C 12, D 33), see *du* above. See also D 8 and 15, G 1 and 2.

## šī (\*šimšu)

As noted earlier (see *pu* above), it is proposed here that the circle sign should be understood not as a mouth (Mendenhall, 24, 30) but as the sun, and this would provide the *šī* that is lacking on Mendenhall's table of syllabic signs (19, Table 3). It is worth noting (cp. Colless 1988, 51) that in the short cuneiform alphabet a circle is used for *š* (covering *š* and *t*; see Segert 1984, 20 and 35). The acrophonic agent in the Byblian syllabary would be \*šimšu "sun". This seems to go against the tide of cognates which have *a* as the vowel: Akd. *šamšu*, Ugr. *šapšu*, Arb. *šams*, but Hbr. *šemeš* is *šimš* with suffixes, and cp. Jewish Arm. *šimšā*.

The main cases for consideration, in deciding between *pu* and *šī*, are *šilitatiya*, "of my dominion" (D 11, 13), and *šisa* (B 1, E 1, F 1). Mendenhall (51-52) accepts "of my dominion" as the meaning of his form *pulitatiya* (in his discussion of the point he adduces Arb. *faltatun* "unexpected event", which is close in its form but remote in its meaning). To my mind the choice lies between the root *plṭ* (D "save") or *šlṭ* ("rule"), with the *t* assimilated to the following *t*.

In the case of *šisa* or *pusa*, Mendenhall (122-123) compares Punic *ps* "tablet" (or "list"), and relates Arb. *fa's* "mattock" to the spatula shape of the copper plates on which texts B, E, F are inscribed. But *šisa* can be explained by Akd. *šīsu* "claim" (from *šasu* "call"). Mendenhall (127) explains the accusative singular ending (-a) as indicating the predicate of an implied "This is".

In D 5, Mendenhall (43-44) reads *putuya* as cognate with Arb. *futuwwa* "honourableness"; *putuya banu* is translated as "honourably among us"; if it is really *šituya banu* then it might mean "drinking with us" (*šty* "drink").

## šu (\*šubtu)

Besides *ša*, Mendenhall (19) has *ta*, *ti*, *tu* signs. For his supposed *ta* see *ti* above. For his *ti* see *zi* above. His *tu* will be catalogued here as *šu*, though the examples given hereunder indicate that it included *tu* in its range. The sign in question is a transverse cross with an oblique line hanging from its top left point. Mendenhall does not discuss it, but in D 23 (70-71) he thinks it functions as a relative pronoun. Dunand (108, sign F1) presumes it is a staff with a whip, and refers to Egp. hieroglyph S44, rod and flagellum (Gardiner, 510), a Pharaonic emblem. This suggests Hbr. *šēbet*, "rod" or

"sceptre" (cp. *šēbeṭ miṣrayim* "the rod of Egypt", Zech. 10:11), Akd. *šabbiṭu*; justification for the syllable *šu* has to be sought in Jewish Arm. *šubṭa*. Old South Arabic *sbṭ* ("strike, beat, whip") shows that we are not dealing with etymological *t*.

Examples of its use are: *wišubutam* "rent" (A7, A9, but Mendenhall, 117, "dwelling"), cp. Akd. *waššābūtum* "rental" (von Soden, 1488), common Semitic root *wšb*, *wṭb*, *yšb*, "dwell", the consonant here being *t*; *'ilila ti'ašu*, "they make a covenant" (D 14), Hbr. *'šb*, OSArb. *'sy* or *'s*, "make" (but Mendenhall, 60, "The compact they injure", Arb. *'aṭa* "act corruptly"), and here it may be etymological *s* or *t*. In C 2, *šutuni* appears to be a personal name, which Mendenhall (96) relates to Ugr. *ṣṭy* and Hbr. *šet* (Seth), with an archaic *-un* (cp. Zebulun and Yeshurun).

In D 23, Mendenhall (70-71) sees *šu* functioning as a relative pronoun (cp. *zi* above).

#### ta (\**tarašu*)

For *ta* Mendenhall (19) has an upright rectangle without a base, and he has tacitly combined this with the character having two of the three lines crossing at one corner. Dunand (101, sign D4; 111, sign G6) distinguishes the two: the first is compared with the Egp. cursive hieratic hieroglyph for a house; the second is considered to be a wooden assemblage, and to my mind the closest hieroglyph would be M43A (Buurman, 146), a simplification of M43 (Gardiner, 484), a vine on two props, denoting "vine" or "wine". The first pictograph, with clearcut corners, resembles a gateway; this suggests Arm. and Syr. *tara'*, *tar'ā* "gate", but this word really has initial *t*, as in Ugr. *tgr*, Hbr. *ša'ar*. The two forms do seem to represent *ta* indiscriminately; for example, *ta* occurs in *tisataru* in D 3 and D 24 with square corners, but in D 26 with a cross on the right side. The vine seems more likely than the gate as the subject of both forms, and the Ugr. word *trṭ* "wine" can be brought to bear on this interpretation, though Hbr. *tîrōš* does not support the syllable *ta*, nor does Hieroglyphic Hittite *tuwarsa* "vine" (Gordon, 1965, 499, 2613). Akd. *tillatu* "grape vine" should also be mentioned, though this is not attested early enough (von Soden, 1358b). See also *gu* above, as possibly connected with *\*gupnu* "vine".

Dunand (87) states that this sign (with a cross on the corner) was found on a large storage jar in a temple at Byblos; he says that this pithos was for water, but could it have been for wine?



Mendenhall (34-41) is able to sort out the three *t* syllables in the first few lines of text D (1-4): *'i'itu'uni matati la kiti yatuba'ibidu ... pa tisataruni tahima*; my translation (differing somewhat from Mendenhall's) would be, "I bring the lands to me, to the truth, they pledge themselves ... and so they guard for me the boundary ...". Here *matati* (*mātāti*) would be acc. pl. fem. of *mātu* "land" (cp. Akd.), and *kiti* (*kitti*, cp. Akd. *kittu* "truth") gen. case sg., after the preposition *la* "to"; this separates *ta* and *ti*, and thereafter *tu* falls neatly into place.

Another instructive instance occurs in D 25: *tali tiḥata tu'i la kiti*, "dependent instead of straying from the truth" (see further Mendenhall, 72-73).

### ti (\*tibbuttu)

This is a problematic sign, identified as *ti* by Mendenhall (19), without comment. Dunand (104, sign E8) sees the Egp. adz hieroglyph (U18, Gardiner, 518) as a possible analogue. Another idea would be to connect hieroglyph U37, a razor (Gardiner, 520), with Hbr. *ta'ar* "razor" or "sheath". But my preference is for Akkadian *tibbuttu* "harp".

The sign is used frequently: as a verbal prefix in *tisataru* (D 3, 23, 26), *tisakiru* (D 12), *ti'ašū* (D 14); to show inflexions on feminine nouns, *matati* "lands" (D 2, plural oblique), *kiti* "truth" (D 2, singular genitive), *dagati* "fish" (A 6, 8, pl. oblique or sg. gen.).

### tu (\*tu)

The syllable *tu* appears as a cross, like T (*Taw*) in the alphabet (Colless 1988, 51-52), cp. Hbr. *tāw* "mark"; and Mendenhall (19, 20, 31) finds support for this in a cuneiform abecedary from Ugarit, which has the value *tu* for the letter *t* (see Segert 1984, 21). Dunand (113, sign I17, indeterminate) does not connect it with any hieroglyph, but Mendenhall (24) proposes Z11 (Gardiner, 539), supposedly two planks crossed and joined, but a connection is hard to see between that and *tu*. Perhaps Akd. *tū*, signifying "oath formula" or "signature" (von Soden, 1364a) might find a place in this discussion, if Hbr. *tāw* could mean "signature" (Job 31:35?). The mark denoting witnesses on Byblian documents C, E, F (and B?) has the same form as the sign for *ga* (see above), and is not a cross.

For examples of *tu* see *ta* above.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The alterations and additions I have made to Mendenhall's Table 4 (Acrophonic Syllables) and 5 (Comparative Forms, in Egyptian hieroglyphs and in the Phoenician and Arabian alphabets) are too numerous to recount, and reference should be made to my own table of signs and the discussion above.

The changes I have made to Mendenhall's scheme of Byblian syllabic signs and values (as set out on his Table 3) are many, but for the most part relatively minor.

His *qa* (a pot), found only in texts A and G, is really a monumental form of the triangular *du* of texts C and D (from *\*dudu*, a jar, not from *\*duggu*, a fish).

It seems that *z* and *d* are not distinguished in this script, as is likewise the case in the proto-alphabet, and so Mendenhall's *du* (*\*duru'u* "arm") becomes *zu*, and his *zu* is actually *za* (including *da*, from *\*danabu* "tail"), while his *ti* (a pyramid) provides the missing *zi* (*\*ziqquratu* "ziggurat").

Mendenhall also tries to separate *h* from *b*, and although his *ha*, *hi*, and *hu* seem to be correct, they also cover words that have etymological *h*. Consequently, his *hu* should be given a different sound value, and I propose *tu* (cp. Akd. *turru* "knot"; the sign resembles the hieroglyph for "bind", which depicts a band of string or linen). Mendenhall (12, 19, 28) has no *t* signs, but his highly unlikely *ma'* is surely *ta*, the hieroglyph denoting *nefer* "good", to be related to *tābu* "good", as in the proto-alphabet (Colless 1988, 41-42; 1990, 4; 1991, 27). The sign Mendenhall reads as *ta* seems to be *ti* (the hieroglyph for the scribe goddess Seshat; possibly from *\*tipsar* "scribe").

However, my *tu* (*\*turru* "knot") might actually (or even additionally?) represent *su*, given that the proto-alphabetic *s* is connected with *šrr* "tie, bind" (the sign is a tied bag, in my view, Colless 1988, 48-49). Mendenhall already has a *su*, which could simply be a variant of my *za* (an animal's tail), or else it is a sunshade, evoking *\*sillu* "shade", and hence *si*; his *sa* (which resembles the Phoenician *S*) may be merely a misshapen *la*; and the existence of his *si* ("a plant") is improbable (see *s* above).

More importantly, by moving Mendenhall's *pu* and *yu* signs into the sibilant area, as *ši* and *si* respectively, a very anomalous situation has been remedied: *š* (Mendenhall's *ša*, *ta*, *ti*, *tu*) was in 17th position on the consonant frequency table (with a mere 25 instances, as

compared with 147 for *t*), even though the Ugaritic sample followed by Mendenhall (11, Table 1) has *š* plus *t̄* (46 + 45 = 91) more frequent than *t* (87 instances), and thus in second place. As can be seen from my table of frequency it now has the 11th position (36 instances). This compares reasonably with the Phoenician column (10th), but not the Sinaitic or the Hebrew (both 6th), but at least *š* is now among the first 12. An explanation for the differences can be found in the *s* (Samek) statistics. Because Mendenhall had only *sa* (\**samaku* "pillar"), with 27 instances, *s* stood in 16th position, and in fact it usually appears well down in the list, as the table indicates (18, 14, 22, 18). But with the addition of *si* and *su* (5 + 1 instances) its total of 33 cases brings it to 13th position, very close to *š*. The fact of the matter is that Byblian *s* covers some cases which appear in Hebrew as *šin/šîn*, and this naturally brings *s* and *š* closer together on the chart of relative frequency.

The table itself needs further explanation.

**Byblian** refers to syllabic texts A-G only (the first and last of these are stone monuments, the rest copper plates; the enigmatic text I is omitted from this survey).

**Phoenician** means the first six alphabetic inscriptions of Byblos (as presented in Gibson 1982, 10-18). In tabulating *g*, a handicap has been imposed for its repeated occurrence in the name *Gubla* (Byblos); *h* also appears too often (though no compensation has been made for it), being found in the names of three of the kings mentioned in the texts; *l* comes out in first place because of the ubiquity of the name Baal and also the word *mlk* "king".

**Sinaitic** indicates the proto-alphabetic inscriptions of Sinai, according to my decipherment (Colless 1990); the letter Z is in superabundance here, because most sentences are in the form "This is..." (*z* ...); *y* is in a completely uncharacteristic position here (20th), because there are no 3rd p. verbs (prefixed with *y*-); *w* does not appear as "and", hence its unusual 19th slot (contrast Hebrew).

**Ugaritic** refers to a sample from the Baal and Anat cycle, as analysed by Mendenhall (11-12, tables 1 and 2). His data have been transferred to my chart, and some pairs are presented together: *t̄/š*, *ḡ/g*, *h/b*, *t/z*, *z/d*.

**Hebrew** means the segment of Genesis analysed by Mendenhall (12). He points out that *t* fell from its eminent position to 11th place because it was dropped at the end of many feminine nouns and verbs, while the use of the *waw* consecutive construction vastly

increased the frequency of *w* in Hebrew. Note that *w* is not found as "and" in the Byblian syllabic texts, though its repeated appearance in the verb *kawana* ("be") gives it 16th position.

On the question of the relation of the **proto-alphabet** to the **Byblian signary**, the first point to make is that Byblos has not yielded up any proto-alphabetic inscriptions, so a seductive hypothesis arises: that the Phoenician linear alphabet, as represented in Byblian inscriptions from the Iron Age, developed out of the Byblian syllabic script. Certainly the shapes of the Byblian signs were known to alphabetic scribes, because they often erased syllabic inscriptions and used the writing materials again for alphabetic texts (Gibson 1982, 9, 12, 17); and possibly these shapes influenced some of the letters of the alphabet; but the Phoenician alphabet is really a development of the pictographic alphabet of Bronze Age Canaan (cp. Colless 1991). And when we compare the Byblian signs with the proto-alphabetic pictographs, we find a considerable number of coincidences.

' (alep) the "ox" (hieroglyph F1) occurs in the Byblian signary as 'a, but it is more pictographical in the Sinai proto-alphabetic texts than anywhere else.

B as a "house" (*baytu*; cp. hieroglyph O1) occurs in both writing systems, typically as a square, and sometimes with one side moving in to diagonally bisect the square.

G is a *gamlu*, a "throwstick" or "boomerang" (T14), hence Byblian *ga*.

D and Byblian *da* go with *daltu* "door" (O31) and not with "fish" (*dag* or *\*dug*).

H is a jubilating human figure (A28), Byblian *hi* (from *\*hillulu* "jubilation").

W is *waw* "hook" in the alphabet, and apparently Byblian *wa* likewise.

Z does not seem to have any correspondences.

Ḥ and Ḥ are separated in the proto-alphabet, but not in the Byblian script, and the signs are different in all cases.

T, derived from *tabu* "good" and the Egyptian *nefer* hieroglyph (F35), appears as *ta* in the Byblian signary.

Y was based on the hieroglyph (D36) of a hand and forearm, going with *yadu* "hand", but this pictograph was used for Byblian *zu* (*zuru* 'u).

K and Byblian *ka* both seem to go with *kappu* "hand" (D46),

though all the Byblian examples are stylized; and some of the alphabetic examples are similar to *ki*, which may be a palm branch (\**kippatu*?).

**L** is thought to be a shepherd's crook (*lamed* "a goad"; S39), but Byblian *la* is the hieroglyph for "night" (Hbr. *layil* ; N2), which, intriguingly, includes a shepherd's staff in its symbolism.

**M** appears as a wavy line representing water (N35), and as one form of *mu* in the Byblian signary.

**N** and *na* alike are derived from *nahašu* "snake", but a different hieroglyph for cobra (I10, I12) is used in each case.

**S** appears in the alphabet as *samek* ("support"), sometimes a fish (K1), sometimes a pillar (R11; spinal column as support?); the pillar is Byblian *sa*, but there is no fish sign in the syllabary.

**'** (ayin) is a human eye (D4), Byblian *'a*.

**P** is a human mouth (*pu*; D21); Byblian *pu* may have been the same, but there do not seem to be any cases of it in the syllabic texts (unless the circle sign is a mouth and not the sun, *š*).

**Š** is a tied bag (root *šrr* "tie"; V33); the Byblos script has a "tied knot" sign (cp. V12; see *š* and *tu*).

**Q** is a cord wound on a stick (V24; *qaw* "line"), but nothing like this occurs in the extant Byblian inscriptions.

**R** is a human head (D1; *ra'išu* "head"), Byblian *ra*.

**Š** appears as a wavy line, sometimes angular and sometimes rounded, Byblian *ša*, perhaps human breasts (see *ša* above).

**T** and Byblian *tu* are a cross (Hbr. *tāw* "mark", "signature"? ) (cp. Z11 or M42?).

Thus there are at least fifteen correspondences between the two writing systems, the exceptions being Z, H, H, Y, L, P, Š, Q, and the last three of these might be shown to have alphabetic connections if we knew the full story of their representation in the Byblos signary. These cannot be mere coincidences: there is a connecting line running from Egyptian hieroglyphs through the Byblian syllabic signs to the Canaanite alphabetic pictographs and ultimately to the letters of the Phoenician linear alphabet and all alphabets. However, it would be too speculative to say that the proto-alphabet was simply a reduction of the Byblian syllabary.

The Byblos scribes combined the idea of a syllabary already present in Mesopotamian cuneiform writing, with the types of symbols found in the Egyptian hieroglyphic system, and constructed a simplified syllabary with signs based on the acrophonic principle,

whereby the first syllable of the name of the symbol was to be read. The inventors of the alphabet likewise used the acrophonic principle, but the pictographs were now reduced to one-third of the number in the syllabary, because only the initial consonant of the name of the pictogram was pronounced when constructing words out of the pictures. In one sense, the syllabary was being reduced to an alphabet, the signs now simply standing for one sound not two; but from another point of view the model of the Egyptian writing system was being drastically modified, eliminating all the inessential clutter (such as determinatives and signs representing more than one consonant at a time) until all that remained was a set of single consonant signs, like the set embedded in the Egyptian signary. Egyptian hieroglyphic writing had functioned without vowels, and Semitic alphabets followed the same path. The Greeks eventually introduced vowel letters into the alphabet and made it a more serviceable instrument for communication.

The assumption behind this evolutionary scheme is that the Byblian syllabary preceded the proto-alphabet in time. Is this true? The oldest alphabetic evidence dates from the 16th century B.C.E. (Colless 1991, 20, Gezer Jars); but the date of the Byblian inscriptions is unknown. A possible reason for the lack of proto-alphabetic inscriptions at Byblos is that Byblian scribes were using their own syllabary, while elsewhere in Canaan the pictographic alphabet was in vogue, alongside the cuneiform alphabet that subsequently came into use in Ugarit and other cities. In the Iron Age (after 1200), the syllabary and the cuneiform alphabet gave way to the linear alphabet, which had developed out of the pictographic alphabet.

The proto-alphabet was a phenomenon of the Late Bronze Age (1500-1200), though it was invented in the Middle Bronze Age (2000-1500), and for all we know it may have been the predecessor of the Byblian syllabary. However, the language that Mendenhall has unveiled in the Byblian texts is regarded by him as belonging to the Early Bronze Age, before 2000, perhaps the 24th century (Mendenhall, 2-3, 7). This view possibly encounters difficulties from some of the signs in the signary: some of the hieroglyphs used by the Byblian scribes are classed by Gardiner as belonging to the Middle Kingdom (after 2000) and even to the New Kingdom (16th century; see *hu* above). Certainly the Semitic language revealed to us in Mendenhall's decipherment looks very archaic, and it seems to be (analogically speaking) the "Latin" (Proto-Canaanite) from which "Italian"

(Phoenician) and “Spanish” (Hebrew) developed. Its verb “be” is *kawana*, as in Phoenician, as opposed to Hebrew *hyb*. It is surely older than the language of the Byblian alphabetic inscriptions of the Iron Age; for example, it does not have *wa* for “and” (as in Ugaritic and Phoenician), but *pa* (cp. Ugaritic) and *ma* (cp. Akkadian). However, the analogy of Latin in medieval Europe, as also Sumerian in ancient Mesopotamia, shows that an archaic language can be kept alive for centuries in scribal tradition. Moreover, one reviewer of Mendenhall’s book argues that “all linguistic features he treats as archaic can be taken also as innovations or as dialect-specific traits” (Izre’el 1988, 520). And Mendenhall (2) admits: “The nagging question concerning the date of these texts cannot be answered with certainty on the basis of data now available”.

Another severe critic of Mendenhall’s decipherment accepts that in view of the provenance of the texts (Byblos) and the restricted number of signs, this writing system would be “a (probably Middle Bronze Age) West Semitic syllabary of some sort (perhaps with a few determinative signs included for good measure in the Egyptian model)” (Kaufman 1989, 85).

In my attempt to improve Mendenhall’s solution along such lines, namely to look for determinatives, I have found only one doubtful case (see *mu*); but a search for logograms, as in proto-alphabetic inscriptions (Colless 1990, 5), may have been fruitful: see *ba* (“house”), *zu* (“arm”), *ma* (“sickle”), and *u* (“tithe”) as possibilities, whereby the pictograph can sometimes be read as the whole word it represents, not just its initial syllable. My new interpretations of some sequences in the texts are presented above, in the discussions of each sign, and to understand these the reader will need to refer to Dunand’s photographs and drawings of the documents, and Mendenhall’s transliteration and presentation of the texts.

Critics of Mendenhall have rejected his decipherment as a failure, but if “decipherment” means finding the right syllabic values for the signs, then Mendenhall’s achievement is praiseworthy, even if it is not perfect. We tend to think that we can already read ancient Canaanite, and if we cannot readily comprehend Mendenhall’s transcriptions of the Byblian texts, then Mendenhall must be at fault. However, he rightly reminds us that Ugaritic texts are still only half understood (Mendenhall, 15, 17). Moreover, a bronze spatula from Byblos has syllabic writing on both sides, which is “undecipherable” (simply because it has been erased by an ancient scribe), and on one

side is a palimpsest inscription in Byblian Phoenician, a known language, and yet the interpretation of this text has produced no consensus among scholars (see Gibson 1982,9-11). The decipherment of Byblian syllabic writing has perhaps been achieved, for the most part; but the interpretation of Byblian texts, syllabic and alphabetic, still has a long way to go.

### TABLE OF CONSONANT FREQUENCY

	Byblian	Phoenician	Sinaitic	Ugaritic	Hebrew
<b>T</b>	1 (145)	3 (26)	1 (48)	2 (87)	11
<b>M</b>	2 (113)	2 (33)	4 (38)	1 (111)	1
<b>B</b>	3 (70)	4 (25)	2 (48)	3 (78)	8
<b>N</b>	4 (66)	6 (16)	3 (40)	8 (52)	12
<b>L</b>	5 (61)	1 (43)	5 (35)	5 (76)	4
<b>'</b>	6 (57)	7 (16)	7 (30)	6 (64)	2
<b>Y</b>	7 (52)	9 (13)	20 (2)	10 (46)	7
<b>H</b>	8 (48)	15 (9)	13 (13)	13 (38)	13
<b>R</b>	9 (42)	12 (11)	10 (21)	4 (78)	3
<b>K</b>	10 (38)	5 (17)	9 (27)	7 (59)	9
<b>Š</b>	11 (36)	10 (13)	6 (32)	11,12 (46 + 45)	6
<b>D</b>	12 (35)	16 (7)	17 (5)	9 (51)	14
<b>S</b>	13 (33)	18 (5)	14 (10)	22 (10)	18
<b>'</b>	14 (32)	11 (13)	8 (28)	14,24 (32 + 5)	10
<b>H</b>	15 (31)	8 (15)	12 (5 + 9)	16,20 (25 + 15)	15
<b>W</b>	16 (27)	13 (11)	19 (2)	15 (30)	5
<b>P</b>	17 (22)	14 (10)	18 (3)	17 (21)	16
<b>T</b>	18 (13?)	21 (2)	22 (1)	25,26 (3 + 3)	22
<b>G</b>	19 (8)	17 (6*)	15 (9)	19 (16)	20
<b>Z</b>	20 (6)	19 (5)	11 (15!)	23 (5),	21
<b>Š</b>	21 (2?)	22 (1)	16 (9)	21 (14)	19
<b>Q</b>	22 (0?)	20 (3)	21 (2)	18 (16)	17

### ABBREVIATIONS

Akd. = Akkadian; Arb. = Arabic; Arm. = Aramaic; Egyp. = Egyptian  
Hbr. = Hebrew; Phn. = Phoenician; Syr. = Syriac; Ugr. = Ugaritic

### REFERENCE BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albright, W.F., 1936, The Early Evolution of the Hebrew Alphabet, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 63: 8-12.  
—, 1966, *The Proto-Sinaitic Inscriptions and Their Decipherment*. Harvard Theological Studies 22 (Cambridge).



- Biella, Joan Copeland, 1982, *Dictionary of Old South Arabic, Sabaean Dialect* (Chico).
- Buurman, Jan, et al., 1988, *Inventaire des signes hiéroglyphiques en vue de leur saisie informatique* (Paris).
- Cagni, L., (ed.), 1981, *La Lingua di Ebla* (Napoli).
- Colless, Brian E., 1988, Recent Discoveries Illuminating the Origin of the Alphabet, *Abr-Nahrain* 26: 30-67.
- , 1990, The Proto-alphabetic Inscriptions of Sinai, *Abr-Nahrain* 28:1-52.
- , 1991, The Proto-alphabetic Inscriptions of Canaan, *Abr-Nahrain* 29: 18-66.
- Dhorme, E., 1946, Déchiffrement des inscriptions pseudo-hiéroglyphiques de Byblos, *Comptes-rendues de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* 1946: 360-365, 472-479.
- Dhorme, E., 1946-1948, Déchiffrement des inscriptions pseudo-hiéroglyphiques de Byblos, *Syria* 25:1-35.
- Dunand, M., 1945, *Byblia Grammata: Documents et recherches sur le développement de l'écriture en Phénicie* (Beirut).
- Fronzaroli, P., (ed.), 1984, *Studies on the Language of Ebla* (Quaderni di Semitistica 13).
- Gardiner, A., 1966, *Egyptian Grammar*, 3rd edn (London).
- Gibson, J.C.L., 1978, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh).
- , 1982, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions: III, Phoenician Inscriptions* (Oxford).
- Gordon, Cyrus H., 1965, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome).
- , 1987, with G.A. Rendsburg and N.H. Winter, Eds, *Eblaïtica* 1 (Winona Lake).
- Hrozný, B., 1946, Die hieroglyphische Stele von Byblos. Ein Entzifferungsversuch. *Archivum Orientale Pragense* 15: 138-157.
- Huehnergard, John, 1987, *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription* (Atlanta).
- Izre'el, Shlomo, 1988, Review of Mendenhall 1985, *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 108: 519-520.
- Kaufman, S.A., 1989, Review of Mendenhall 1985, *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, 276: 85-86.
- Kochler, Ludwig, and Baumgartner, Walter, 1958, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros* (Leiden).
- Martin, M., A Preliminary Report after Re-Examination of the Byblian Inscriptions, *Orientalia* 30 (1961) 46-78.
- , Revision and Reclassification of the Proto-Byblian Signs, *Orientalia* 31 (1962) 250-271, 339-363.
- Mendenhall, George E., 1985, *The Syllabic Inscriptions from Byblos* (Beirut).
- Moran, W.L., 1988, Review of Mendenhall 1985, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 50: 508-510.

- Rainey, A.F., 1976, A Tri-lingual Cuneiform Fragment from Tel Aphek, *Tel Aviv* 3: 137-140.
- Segert, Stanislav, 1976, *A Grammar of Phoenician and Punic* (München).
- , 1984, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Berkeley).
- Sobelmann, H., The Proto-Byblian Inscriptions: A Fresh Approach, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 6 (1961) 226-245.
- von Soden, Wolfram, 1981, *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* (Wiesbaden).
- Ungnad, Arthur, and Matouš, Lubor, 1964, *Grammatik des Akkadischen* (München).

## JOSEPHUS' PORTRAIT OF SAMUEL

BY

LOUIS H. FELDMAN

### 1. Introduction

While it is true that Josephus, in his *Antiquities*, has relatively little to say about the prophets as such, nevertheless, inasmuch as, in many cases, they played important roles in the politics of their day, Josephus the historian is much interested in them. Moreover, Josephus saw a significant link between the roles of prophets and historians and, indeed, regards the prophets as the immediate predecessors of historians. Thus, in the proem to the *War* (1.18) he declares that he will begin his work at the point where "the historians of these events [i.e. the biblical history] and our prophets conclude." In fact, it is only because the prophets alone, who received their inspiration (*ἐπὶ τοῖς*, *Against Apion* 1.37) from G-d, are responsible for the Holy Scriptures that we find no discrepancy in what is written. Indeed, it is striking that in his apologetic treatise *Against Apion* (1.37-43) Josephus does not refer to the biblical writings as sacred but rather stresses that they were written by prophets who were inspired. Moreover, there is surely significance in the fact that in no fewer than 169 instances Josephus has deliberately introduced the noun "prophet" or the verb "prophecy" where it is not to be found in the original text.<sup>1</sup> One might suppose that Josephus, in line with his rationalizing tendency, has introduced the word "prophets" where the Bible has G-d speaking directly; but we may note that of the 169 instances there are only eleven cases where Josephus substitutes a prophet for the direct statement of G-d. In almost all the other instances, where the Hebrew has merely the name of the prophet Josephus has added the identifying word "prophet."<sup>2</sup> This interest in the prophets must have been heightened

<sup>1</sup> See my "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus," *Journal of Theological Studies* 41 (1990) 389-394. We may note that in the *Biblical Antiquities* of Josephus' presumed contemporary Pseudo-Philo the name "Samuel" is found sixteen times where it is missing in the biblical report (49.7, 49.8 (*bis*), 50.8, 51.1, 51.2, 51.6, 51.7, 53.11, 53.12, 54.5, 56.4, 57.4 (*bis*), 59.4, 64.2).

<sup>2</sup> This emphasis on the prophets may be seen in Josephus' portrait of Manasseh.

by the fact that the historical books of the Bible subsequent to the Pentateuch are reckoned by Josephus (*Ap.* 1.40), as they were by the rabbis, as prophetic books, even though the role of the prophets in several of them, notably Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles, is surely less important than that of the political leaders. Indeed, Josephus goes on to remark (*Ap.* 1.41) that the reason why the historical works from the time of Artaxerxes in the mid-fifth century B.C.E. to his own time are less reliable is that they did not have the prophets to attend to them. In fact, we may conjecture that one reason (though, of course, not the chief reason) for Josephus' popularity with the Church is precisely the emphasis which he placed on the prophets, who are so crucial for the theological underpinnings of Christianity.

Moreover, Josephus saw a kinship between himself and the prophets in at least three respects—as analyzer of the present, as historian of the past, and as predictor of the future. In this respect there is a correlation between the biblical prophet and the Greek prophet Calchas, for example, in Homer (*Iliad* 1.70),<sup>3</sup> “who knew the things that are, will be, and were before.”<sup>4</sup> That a prophet is concerned with recording the past may be seen from the fact that Moses (*Ant.* 4.320), at the close of his life, “prophesies” to each of the tribes the things that are past (γεγόμενα), whereupon the multitude recalling these events, bursts into tears. The kingship of the prophet and the historian may perhaps also be seen in the fact that Josephus (*Ant.* 1.240), quoting Alexander Polyhistor, refers to the historian Cleodemus Malchus as “the prophet.”<sup>5</sup> When Josephus does include the deeds of the prophets in his *Antiquities* he does so because, as he says (*Ant.* 9.208) in justifying his inclusion of the story of Jonah, he has promised to give an exact account of Jewish history.

Another kinship between the prophet and the historian is that

Thus, whereas the Bible (1 Kgs 21:9, 2 Chr 33:10) declares that Manasseh did not listen to the words of G-d, Josephus (*Ant.* 10.39) highlights the role of the prophets, noting that it was to them that Manasseh did not listen; if they had listened, he says, they might have so profited as not to experience any misfortune.

<sup>3</sup> On Josephus' knowledge of Homer see my “Josephus as a Biblical Interpreter: the *Aqedah*,” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 75 (1984-85) 215-216.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* 2.5: “A prophet of the truth is one who knows the things that were, that they were, the things that are, that they are, and the things that will be, that they will be.” See Willem C. van Unnik, “A Formula Describing Prophecy,” *New Testament Studies* 9 (1963) 86-94.

<sup>5</sup> See David E. Aune, “The Use of προφήτης in Josephus,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982) 419-421.

both seek to predict the future. One is reminded of the famous passage in Thucydides (1.22.4), one of Josephus' favorite authorities,<sup>6</sup> that "whoever wishes to have a clear view of events which have happened and of those which will some day, in all human probability, happen again in the same or in a similar way" will find his history useful.<sup>7</sup> Finally, of course, Josephus viewed himself personally as having a kinship to the prophets in that he regarded himself as having a special gift for prediction, like his biblical namesake Joseph, as he allegedly showed in foretelling (*War* 3.400-402) that Vespasian would become emperor.<sup>8</sup>

Moreover, the basic link between prophecy and history is that the criterion for both is truth. Thus Thucydides (1.21.1), in a telling criticism of his predecessors, whom he refers to as story-tellers (λογογράφοι), says that they composed their works with a view rather to pleasing the ear than to telling the truth, whereas the chief goal of a history should be accuracy (1.22.1).<sup>9</sup> Similarly, Josephus (*War* 1.2) is critical of his predecessors for misrepresenting the facts and for not seeking as their goal historical accuracy (τὸ ... ἀκριβὲς τῆς ἱστορίας).

<sup>6</sup> Henry St. John Thackeray, *Josephus the Man and the Historian* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion, 1929) 110-114.

<sup>7</sup> It is true that Josephus (*Ant.* 10.210), in his pericope about Daniel, declares that he has not thought it proper to relate the meaning of the stone because "I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be." Nevertheless, this is merely a good excuse, because he does not wish to offend his patrons, the Romans, to whose overthrow the passage actually refers, since the stone was said in Josephus' day to be a symbol of the messiah, who would perform this.

<sup>8</sup> Another link between Josephus and the prophets may have come through the Essenes, with whom Josephus in his youth (*Life* 10) spent considerable time and of whom he writes in such detail and in such praise (*War* 2.119-161), since, we are told (*War* 2.159), the Essenes were particularly well versed in the prophetic books and, indeed, had a special gift for prediction themselves. Likewise, the Pharisees, with whom Josephus allied himself (*Life* 12), after experimenting with the three major sects of the Jews, were said to have a special gift of foreknowledge (*Ant.* 17.43), as we can see from the predictions of Pollio the Pharisee (*Ant.* 17.4) and his disciple, Samaïas (*Ant.* 14.174-175). Furthermore, Josephus apparently looked upon himself as a kind of latter-day Jeremiah, as we can see from the explicit reference to Jeremiah in his speech to the Jews (*War* 5.391-392); and he clearly saw and emphasized the parallel between the first destruction of the Temple so vehemently warned against by the prophets and the destruction of the second Temple, against which he, in turn, had warned his fellow countrymen.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Thucydides' further remarks (1.22.2): "As to the facts of the occurrences of the war, I have thought it my duty to give them, not as ascertained from any chance informant nor as seemed to me probable, but only after investigating with the greatest possible accuracy each detail, in the case both of the events in which I myself participated and of those regarding which I got my information from others."

Likewise, in his paraphrase of the Bible, Josephus (*Ant.* 8.417) stresses, more than does the Bible (1 Kings 22:38), the acknowledgement of the truth of Elijah's prophecy. In an extra-biblical editorial (*Ant.* 8.418), Josephus proceeds to add that inasmuch as the prophecies spoken by Elijah and Micaiah came true, we ought to acknowledge the greatness of G-d and should not think that statements that flatter us are more worthy of belief than the truth. The quality of Isaiah which Josephus (*Ant.* 10.35) singles out, in a kind of editorial about him, is that he was marvellously possessed of truth and was confident of never having spoken what was false. He adds that this attribute of truthful prophecy is to be found not only in Isaiah but also in the other prophets as well. Likewise, a distinctive characteristic of Daniel is that he made plain the accuracy and faithfulness to truth of his prophecies. When Zedekiah, one of the false prophets, attempts to undermine the authority of the prophets, he declares (*Ant.* 8.408), in an extra-biblical detail, that Micaiah is lying, inasmuch as he apparently contradicts another prophet, Elijah, in stating that within three days King Ahab will meet his death. This concern of the prophets with truth is particularly important for Josephus, inasmuch as, according to him, false prophets, claiming divine inspiration (*War* 2.259), formed the background of the revolution against Rome.

Another link between Josephus and the prophets is Josephus' status as a priest. Although it is often said that in the biblical period the priests and the prophets were fundamentally opposed to one another, yet, in his summary of the Mosaic code (*Ant.* 4.200), the very first topic in Josephus is G-d's choice, through prophecy, of Jerusalem as the holy city and the site of the Temple. In a very significant passage, the Bible (Deut 17:9) declares that the difficult cases are to be brought before a high court consisting of the priests and the judge "who is in office in those days"; but Josephus (*Ant.* 4.218) states that the cases are to be brought before "the high priest and the prophet and the council of elders." Moreover, it is to the priests, in a manner reminiscent of Rome's Sibylline Books, that the book containing the prophecy of future events had been consigned (*Ant.* 4.303-304).<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, the cessation of prophecy is

<sup>10</sup> Likewise, it is Phineas the high priest who acts as G-d's interpreter (προφητεύ-σωντος) in Josephus (*Ant.* 5.120, 159), whereas the biblical passage (Judges 20:27-28) has no mention of prophesying. Furthermore, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.115) Saul orders the high priest to don his high priestly robes and to prophesy, whereas there

connected with the destruction of the first Temple, at which time the Urim and Tummim of the high priests likewise ceased to function.<sup>11</sup> Indeed, the Talmud (*Yoma* 73b) declares that no priest is inquired of by the Urim and Tummim who does not speak through the Holy Spirit, that is, through prophecy.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, Tacitus (*Histories* 5.13.2) states that the majority of the Jews believed that their ancient priestly writings contained a prediction that a ruler from Judaea would possess the world. Moreover, the gift for prophecy possessed by the Essenes may well be connected with their acknowledged priestly character. Finally, Josephus himself specifically connects his priestly status and his gift for prophecy when he says of himself (*War* 3.352-353) that being "a priest himself and of priestly descent he was not ignorant of the prophecies in the sacred books."

That Josephus viewed Samuel primarily as a prophet may be discerned in his version of the scene in which he is dedicated to the service of G-d. The Bible (1 Sam 1:24-28) describes the dedication of Samuel and the sacrifices accompanying it; Josephus (*Ant.* 5.347) specifically adds that Hannah dedicated Samuel to G-d to become a prophet.<sup>13</sup> In view of what we have said concerning the guarantee

is no mention of prophesying in 1 Samuel 14:18. Again, it is through the prophecy of the high priest Abimelech (*Ant.* 6.254, 257) that David learns what is to be, whereas in the Bible David inquires directly of the L-rd. Similarly, it is the high priest Eli through whom G-d prophesies concerning his posterity, a message omitted in the biblical text (1 Sam 22:16ff.). Furthermore, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.262 and 268) Nob is the city not only of priests (1 Sam 22:9-23) but also of prophets. Again, in the Bible (1 Sam 28:6) before going to battle against the Philistines, Saul inquires of the L-rd, who does not answer him either by dreams or by the Urim or by prophets; Josephus (*Ant.* 6.328) evidently conflates the three, since he states merely that Saul asked G-d through the prophets. Additionally, it is the high priest Abiathar whom David approaches (*Ant.* 6.359) to prophesy (προφητεῦσαι) before going to battle against the Amalekites, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 30:7) does not mention prophecy here. Before going to battle King David consults the high priest for a prophecy (*Ant.* 7.72-73, 76), whereas in the Bible (2 Sam 5:19, 23) he consults G-d directly. Conversely, the prophet assimilates priestly functions, as we see when King Hezekiah sends (*Ant.* 10.12) a delegate to ask the prophet Isaiah not merely to pray to G-d but also, in an extra-biblical addition (cf. 2 Kgs 19:4), to offer sacrifices.

<sup>11</sup> Josephus (*Ant.* 3.218), to be sure, says that the Urim and Tummim ceased two hundred years before the composition of the *Antiquities*, that is, presumably after the reign of John Hyrcanus, who is presented as having attained the summit both of the priesthood and of prophecy (*War* 1.68-69, *Ant.* 13.299-300).

<sup>12</sup> In particular, Josephus (*Ant.* 13.282-283) notes the prophetic gift of the high priest John Hyrcanus in being able to declare that his sons had just defeated Antiochus. At the beginning of the war against the Romans it was in the Temple (*War* 6.299-300) that a voice was heard declaring that the Presence of G-d was departing.

<sup>13</sup> Similarly, in Pseudo-Philo (*Biblical Antiquities* 51.2), when Hannah comes to

that prophets give to the accuracy of historical books for which they are responsible, this would emphasize the accuracy of the books of Samuel ascribed to him (*Baba Bathra* 14b).

One indication of the attraction of a given biblical personality to Josephus is the sheer amount of space that he allocates to him. Thus Josephus has a ratio of 2.70 as compared with the Hebrew text<sup>14</sup> for his account of Saul, 2.16 for Jeroboam, 2.01 for Jehu, 2.00 for Joseph, 1.98 for Ahab, 1.95 for David, 1.83 for Absalom, 1.54 for Samson, 1.20 for Ezra (.72 as compared with the Greek text of 1 Esdras, which was apparently Josephus' source), .97 for Hezekiah, .91 (or discounting the duplicate material in 2 Chronicles, 1.26) for Manasseh, and .24 for Nehemiah.

If what we have said about the importance of the prophets for Josephus is correct, we should expect him to show this in the amount of space which he devotes to them. Actually, the ratio for Elijah is 1.52, for Daniel 1.32, and for Jonah 1.15. For Samuel (1 Sam 1:1-4:1, 7:3-10:27, 11:12-12:25, 13:8-15, 15:1-3, 15:10-16:13, 19:18-21, 25: 1, 28:11-19; *Ant.* 5.341-351, 6.19-67, 83-94, 100-105, 131-133, 141-166, 221-223, 292-294, 322-336) there are 436 lines in the Hebrew, 701 lines in the Greek version of the Septuagint, and 814 lines in Josephus, making a ratio of Josephus to the Hebrew of 1.87 and to the Septuagint of 1.16.<sup>15</sup> In terms of the amount of space

dedicate her son to the service of G-d, the high priest Eli declares: "By this child is thy womb justified, that thou shouldst set up prophecy before the people." Likewise, in her prayer of thanksgiving, Hannah (*Biblical Antiquities* 5.1.6) reiterates the theme of Samuel as a prophet: "Who is Anna, that a prophet should come out of her?" And when the people offer Samuel to Eli, they again view Samuel as a prophet, as is indicated by their words (*Biblical Antiquities* 5.17), "Let the prophet live among the people."

<sup>14</sup> For Josephus I have used the Loeb Classical Library text. For the Hebrew text I have used the standard edition with the commentary of Meir Loeb Malbim (New York: Friedman, n. d.).

<sup>15</sup> For the Hebrew text I have used the edition of Meir Loeb Malbim (above, note 14). For the Septuagint I have used the text of Alfred Rahlfs, vol. 1 (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935). For Josephus I have used the Loeb Classical Library text, edited by Henry St. J. Thackeray and Ralph Marcus (London: Heinemann, 1934). We may note that Josephus agrees (*Ant.* 6.40) with the Septuagint in stating that if the Israelites choose a king, he will appoint captains of hundreds and captains of thousands, whereas the Hebrew text speaks of captains of thousands and captains of fifties. (Josephus may have been influenced by the organization of David's army, which, we are told [1 Sam 22:7 and 2 Sam 18:1], had captains of thousands and captains of hundreds. He may also have been influenced by the organization of the Roman army, which, indeed, did have captains of hundreds, namely centurions.) Another indication of Josephus' use of the Septua-



devoted to him, then, he is for Josephus clearly the most important of these prophets. The chief evidence, however, for the importance of Samuel to Josephus is that whereas in the Bible he is referred to as a prophet only once (1 Sam 3:20), in Josephus he is referred to thus no fewer than 45 times,<sup>16</sup> by far the largest number of additional occurrences of the word "prophet" or "prophecy" in Josephus as compared with the Bible.<sup>17</sup> Undoubtedly, a good deal of the reason for this relative importance of Samuel for Josephus may be due to the fact that Samuel played such an important role in the politics of his day, which, of course, would be of particular interest to the historian Josephus and his readers. But another reason, as we shall see, is that he did not have the drawbacks of such prophets as Elijah, in terms of the zealotry which Josephus disparaged, and Daniel, in terms of his prophecy of the forthcoming overthrow of the Roman Empire which was so embarrassing to Josephus.

Another criterion of the importance which Josephus attaches to his biblical personalities is the amount of space that he gives to the encomium which he usually presents when their death is mentioned. Thus Josephus' encomium for Saul (*Ant.* 6.343-350) consists of 373 words, for Moses (*Ant.* 4.328-333) 127 words, for David (*Ant.* 7.390-391) 109 words, for Samson (*Ant.* 5.317) 52 words, for Joshua (*Ant.* 5.118) 43 words, for Joseph (*Ant.* 2.198) 33 words, for Isaac (*Ant.* 1.346) 27 words, for Solomon (*Ant.* 8.211) 22 words, for Jacob

gint is to be found in the number of guests at the feast where Samuel anoints Saul as king. The Hebrew text (1 Sam 9:22) gives the number of guests as "about thirty," whereas the Septuagint gives the number as "about seventy," and Josephus (*Ant.* 6.52) likewise gives the number as seventy.

<sup>16</sup> *Ant.* 5.340 vs. 1 Sam 2:26; *Ant.* 5.341 vs. 1 Sam 1:1ff.; *Ant.* 5.347 vs. 1 Sam 2:21; *Ant.* 5.351 vs. 1 Sam 3:19; *Ant.* 6.19 vs. 1 Sam 7:3; *Ant.* 6.31 vs. 1 Sam 7:15; *Ant.* 6.34 vs. 1 Sam 8:3; *Ant.* 6.35 vs. 1 Sam 8:5; *Ant.* 6.38 vs. 1 Sam 8:7; *Ant.* 6.47 vs. 1 Sam 9:6; *Ant.* 6.48 vs. 1 Sam 9:7 (to be sure, identified in these last two instances in the Bible as a "man of G-d"); *Ant.* 6.52 (*bis*) vs. 1 Sam 9:22 and 9:25; *Ant.* 6.54 vs. 1 Sam 10:1; *Ant.* 6.58 vs. 1 Sam 10:14; *Ant.* 6.64 vs. 1 Sam 10:22; *Ant.* 6.66 (*bis*) vs. 1 Sam 10:24-25; *Ant.* 6.77 vs. 1 Sam 11:7; *Ant.* 6.83 vs. 1 Sam 11:14; *Ant.* 6.86 vs. 1 Sam 12:1; *Ant.* 6.92 (*bis*) vs. 1 Sam 12:18-19; *Ant.* 6.100 vs. 1 Sam 13:8; *Ant.* 6.101 (*bis*) vs. 1 Sam 13:8; *Ant.* 6.136 vs. 1 Sam 15:7; *Ant.* 6.141 vs. 1 Sam 15:10-11; *Ant.* 6.143 vs. 1 Sam 15:10-11; *Ant.* 6.144 vs. 1 Sam 15:31; *Ant.* 6.145 vs. 1 Sam 15:31; *Ant.* 6.147 vs. 1 Sam 15:22; *Ant.* 6.151 (*bis*) vs. 1 Sam 15:24-25; *Ant.* 6.153 vs. 1 Sam 15:26; *Ant.* 6.156 vs. 1 Sam 15:35; *Ant.* 6.162 vs. 1 Sam 16:10; *Ant.* 6.220 vs. 1 Sam 19:18; *Ant.* 6.221 vs. 1 Sam 19:18; *Ant.* 6.221 vs. 1 Sam 19:19; *Ant.* 6.292 vs. 1 Sam 25:1; *Ant.* 6.336 vs. 1 Sam 28:18-19; *Ant.* 6.344 vs. no parallel; *Ant.* 7.27 vs. 2 Sam 3:17; *Ant.* 7.53 vs. 2 Sam 5.2 and 1 Chr 11:2.

<sup>17</sup> See my "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus" (above, note 1) 389-391.

(*Ant.* 2.196) 19 words, for Abraham (*Ant.* 1.256) 14 words, and for Hezekiah (*Ant.* 10.36) 5 words.

As for the prophets Josephus has an encomium for Elisha (*Ant.* 9.182) of 26 words, but none at all for Elijah or for Daniel. On the other hand, for Samuel (*Ant.* 6.292-294) he has an encomium of 86 words. If we seek an explanation for this seeming neglect of Elijah, we may conjecture that in presenting the personality of Elijah, Josephus, like the rabbis, was in a quandary. On the one hand, Elijah was a very well-known figure in apocalyptic, sectarian, and popular circles generally who is said to have saved the Jews at crucial points in history and who is compared to Moses himself (*Pesiqta Rabbati* 4.13). And yet, the fact that he was identified with Phinehas the zealot and was popularly regarded as the forerunner of the Messiah, who would by definition lead a revolt against the Roman Empire, made Josephus feel very uneasy about him. In short, inasmuch as Josephus was writing for both a non-Jewish and, to a lesser degree, for a Jewish audience, he was careful neither to denigrate nor to aggrandize the character of Elijah excessively. Josephus likewise walked a tightrope in his treatment (*Ant.* 10.210) of the prophecy of Daniel (2:44-45) which was popularly interpreted to refer to the overthrow of the Roman Empire. A similar dilemma confronted Josephus in his attitude toward the good King Hezekiah, who was regarded by some (*Sanhedrin* 99a) as the Messiah, and toward King David, who is presented as the ancestor of the Messiah, who, in Josephus' day, was understood to be a political leader who would overthrow the Roman Empire and establish an independent Jewish state. Josephus was in no such quandary, however, when it came to the prophet Samuel and hence devoted more space to him and gave him a sizable encomium.

## 2. The Portrait of Samuel in Rabbinic Literature

There is good reason to believe that Josephus was well aware of rabbinic tradition with regard to biblical personalities.<sup>18</sup> The *Mishnat*

<sup>18</sup> That Josephus was acquainted with many traditions which are found recorded in later rabbinic tradition is evident from his remarks (*Life* 8-9) on his excellent education, presumably in the legal and aggadic traditions of Judaism, which he received in his native city of Jerusalem, which was then the center of Jewish learning. Josephus says that he received a reputation for his excellent memory and understanding (*μνήμη τε καὶ σύνεσις*) and that while he was only fourteen years of age he already had won universal applause for his love of learning (*φιλογράμματον*). Furthermore, he asserts (*Ant.* 20.263) that in Jewish learning, which presumably

*Rabbi Eliezer* (*Midrash Agur*, p. 151), dating from perhaps the eighth century but undoubtedly, like other such midrashim, incorporating earlier material, goes so far in its adulation of Samuel as to declare that the greatness bestowed upon him was not granted to any other king or prophet<sup>19</sup> — and presumably this includes King David and such prophets as Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. It notes that no one ever challenged his authority, and applies to him five terms of praise — faithful, honored, prophet, seer, and man of G-d. *Midrash Samuel*, dating from perhaps the eleventh century but again incorporating much earlier material, elevates his stature by asserting (3.4) that even before his birth a heavenly voice went forth and proclaimed the imminent delivery of a righteous man. When people later observed Samuel's deeds they were certain that he was the righteous individual. In particular he is praised for his incorruptibility as a judge (*Nedarim* 38a); thus, in the words of the third-century Rabbi Johanan, he was so honest that he refused compensation even when he was entitled to it. According to a tradition transmitted by the fourth-century Abbaye (*Berakboth* 10b), he was so scrupulous in refusing the hospitality of others that wherever he travelled he took his needs with him. Indeed, according to the third-century Rabbi Eleazar ben Pedat (*Makkoth* 23b), when Samuel (1 Sam 12:3-5) insisted that he had defrauded no one, a voice from heaven declared that G-d Himself was witness to this. He is praised (*Sifre Deuteronomy* 2) for his considerateness in withholding rebuke of the people until shortly before his death so that they not be embarrassed upon meeting their censurer.

In fact, so highly is Samuel regarded in rabbinic tradition that he is actually said to have been equal to Moses and Aaron put together (*Pesiqta Rabbati* 43.182a, compiled, it is thought, in the sixth or seventh century).<sup>20</sup> He is even said to be superior to Moses in that

included the Bible and the Oral Torah, his compatriots admit that he far excelled them all. While it is probably true that Josephus is not averse to boasting, he had so many enemies that it seems unlikely that he would have made such broad claims unless there were some basis to them.

<sup>19</sup> We find similar adulation in Philo, *De Ebrietate* (36.143), who refers to Samuel as the greatest of kings and prophets.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 6 (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1928) 229, note 43, who cites the following sources for the midrashic view that Samuel was Moses' equal and even in some respects his superior: *Midrash Samuel* 9.74-75, *Midrash Psalms* 25.212, *Midrash Numbers Rabbah* 3.8, *Pesiqta de-Rav Kahana* 4.38b, and *Midrash Exodus Rabbah* 16.4. We may add that

(*Exodus Rabbah* 16.4) whereas Moses first had to go into the tabernacle in order to communicate with G-d, G-d chose to speak directly to Samuel. In fact, such a comparison is based on coupling of the names of Moses and Samuel in the Bible itself (Jer 15:1, Ps 99:6).<sup>21</sup>

In contrast to Josephus, however, the rabbis downgraded the importance of the prophets, perhaps in response to Christianity, which stressed the prophets,<sup>22</sup> particularly because of the alleged predictions concerning Jesus as the Messiah, and which declared that the Jews had failed to understand the words of the prophets. The fourth-century Palestinian Rabbi Hunia (Huna) (*Ecclesiastes Rabbah* 1.34) goes so far as to declare that it was only Israel's sin that made it necessary to give them more books than the Pentateuch. On the other hand, one of the rabbis (the fourth-century Babylonian Amemar) explicitly states (*Baba Bathra* 12a) that the sages were superior to the prophets, presumably because the prophet must wait for a divine communication whereas the sage may, on his own initiative, seek to explain the Law. Moreover, as we see in the famous case of Josephus' contemporary Rabbi Eliezer (*Baba Mešia* 59b), miracles and even a voice from Heaven do not count in the scale against human reasoning. According to the third-century Palestinian Aḥa bar Hanina (*Exodus Rabbah* 10.1), G-d says to the prophets, "Do you think that I have no messengers if you do not agree to be my messengers? In this case I will execute my message "by a snake, by a serpent, by a frog." According to his contemporary, the Palestinian Abba bar Kahana (*Megillah* 14a), all the forty-eight prophets and seven prophetesses in Israel were unsuccessful in leading back the Jews to the right path, whereas the evil decree of Ahasuerus did so. In fact, the rabbis explain (*Midrash Psalms* 90.4) that even the words

in the Pseudepigraphic *Biblical Antiquities* (5.2.2) by Josephus' presumed contemporary Pseudo-Philo, Samuel is depicted as being superior even to Moses; "He is like unto Moses my servant; but with Moses I spake when he was eighty years old, but Samuel is eight years old."

<sup>21</sup> Jer 15:1: "Then the L-rd said to me, "Though Moses and Samuel stood before me, yet my heart would not turn toward this people." Ps 99:6: "Moses and Aaron were among his [G-d's] priests, Samuel also was among those who called on his name."

<sup>22</sup> See, e.g., Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, chapter 7, who notes that in Christianity the center of gravity has moved from the Law to the Prophets. See Nahum N. Glatzer, "A Study of the Talmudic-Midrashic Interpretation of Prophecy," *Review of Religion* 10 (1945-46) 115-137, reprinted in his *Essays in Jewish Thought* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama, 1978) 15-35.

of Moses himself, the greatest of the prophets, have no place in the Pentateuch when they are spoken by him as a prophet; and this will explain the exclusion from the Pentateuch of the eleven psalms attributed to Moses. Moreover, there is skepticism toward prophets in rabbinic literature, so that we hear (*Sifra* 27:34) that a prophet may no longer make any innovations. Indeed, the third-century Rabbi Johanan goes so far in his downgrading of prophecy that he declares that since the Temple's destruction prophecy has been taken from prophets and given to fools and children (*Baba Bathra* 12b). Even so popular a figure as the prophet Elijah is said (*Baba Mešia* 85b) to have been smitten with sixty lashes for revealing that the prayers of the second-century Rabbi Hiyya would bring the Messiah before his time.

In the case of Samuel, whereas, as we have noted, Josephus, on no fewer than 45 occasions, adds the epithet "prophet" to his name (so also he is termed a "true prophet" by Ben Sira 46:15), the third-century Palestinian Rabbi Levi, almost surely here as elsewhere reflecting an earlier opinion,<sup>23</sup> declares that Samuel was reprimanded

<sup>23</sup> As to whether we may take at face value the Talmudic statements when rabbis claim to repeat earlier traditions, although there are certain contradictions and discrepancies between some of these attributions and quotations, we may note the importance which the rabbis attached to citing the origin of a remark. As the third-century Rabbi Eleazar ben Pedat said in the name of Rabbi Hanina bar Hama (*Megillah* 15a), citing the verse in the Book of Esther (2:22), "And Esther told the king in the name of Mordecai," "Whoever reports a saying in the name of its originator brings deliverance to the world." See Bernard J. Bamberger, "The Dating of Aggadic Materials," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 68 (1949), who has argued convincingly that the Talmud and Midrashim are compilations of traditional material which had existed orally for a considerable time before they were written down. He notes that extra-rabbinic sources, notably the Septuagint, the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, Hellenistic Jewish writings, and the New Testament—all apparently older than the rabbinic writings in their present form—contain innumerable parallels to the rabbinic aggadah. For example, inasmuch as the second-century Rabbi Meir (*Megillah* 13a) states, as does the Septuagint (Esth 2:7), that Mordecai had married Esther, it is more likely that the translators of the Septuagint were acquainted with this ancient tradition than that Rabbi Meir consulted the Septuagint. Similarly, the plague of 'arob is said by the second-century Rabbi Nehemiah to consist of stinging insects (*Exodus Rabbah* 11:3), whereas the Hebrew is generally said to refer to varied wild beasts; again, this is the explanation of the Septuagint (Exod 8:17). Moreover, one of the frescoes of the third-century Dura Europos synagogue depicts Hiel (1 Kgs 16:34), one of the confederates of the priests of Baal, crouching beneath the altar while a snake approaches to bite him; but such a story is not mentioned in a Hebrew source until much later midrashim (*Exodus Rabbah* 15.14, *Pesiqta Rabbati* 4.13a) and not fully until the thirteenth-century *Yalqut* (on 1 Kgs 18:26). Hence that tradition must have been more ancient. Salomo Rappa-

by G-d for his self-pride (*Sifre Deuteronomy* 17) in stating (1 Sam 9:19) to Saul that he was the seer whom he was seeking. But this is apparently the only negative tradition in all rabbinic literature about Samuel.<sup>24</sup>

### 3. The Virtues of Samuel

#### a. Birth and Early Years

As in the case of Samson,<sup>25</sup> Josephus makes significant changes in his account of the birth of Samuel. In the first place, it is significant that the Lucianic version of the Septuagint in its text of Samuel,<sup>26</sup> which Josephus follows closely in his account of Samuel, asserts (1 Sam 1:14) that the high priest Eli's servant spoke to Hannah when she was praying for a son, whereas Josephus (*Ant.* 5.345), more dramatically, has Eli himself speak to her.<sup>27</sup> Secondly, whereas in the Bible Eli (1 Sam 1:17) asks that G-d grant her petition, Josephus' Eli does not ask G-d but rather makes the dramatic announcement that G-d will grant her children.<sup>28</sup>

port, *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus* (Wien: Alexander Kobut Memorial Foundation, 1930) cites 299 instances where Josephus parallels midrashic traditions that are not recorded until a later period. We may also add that the fact that many midrashic traditions, now extant only in late medieval collections, are found in such Church Fathers as Origen and especially Jerome confirms their antiquity.

<sup>24</sup> Ginzberg (above, note 20) 6.229, note 43, cites a tradition, which the twelfth-century Karaite Judah Hadassi ascribes to the rabbis, that Samuel acted proudly in proclaiming his incorruptibility as a judge in the presence of all the people. He cites another statement by a Karaite that the rabbis accused Samuel of being a corrupt judge. Ginzberg notes that neither of these statements is to be found in extant rabbinic literature, and he finds it very unlikely that the rabbis should have made such remarks in view of the general glorification of Samuel in rabbinic literature.

<sup>25</sup> See my "Josephus' Version of Samson," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 19 (1988) 194-198.

<sup>26</sup> See Eugene Ulrich, "Josephus' Biblical Text for the Books of Samuel," in Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata, eds., *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989) 81-96, who notes, for example, that Josephus (*Ant.* 6.68-69) has an extended passage which is found only in the Dead Sea manuscript of Samuel and is missing from all other surviving biblical texts of Samuel.

<sup>27</sup> Significantly, Josephus' presumed contemporary, Pseudo-Philo, in his *Biblical Antiquities* (50.6), who, like Josephus, generally follows the Lucianic version, agrees with Josephus in having Eli, rather than his servant, speak to Hannah.

<sup>28</sup> So also *Midrash Samuel* 2.12. Both Josephus (*Ant.* 5.345) and the rabbinic tradition (Jerusalem Talmud, *Berakhoth* 4.7b, and *Midrash Samuel* 3.72) state that it was the sheer length of Hannah's prayer that led Eli to suspect that she was drunk. Pseudo-Philo (*Biblical Antiquities* 50.8) follows the biblical text in having Eli tell Hannah merely that her prayer had been heard by G-d; but he clearly implies that

Such predictions, especially by those with religious authority, regularly anticipate the birth of great heroes, both mythological and historical. Indeed, Josephus' additions may best be appreciated when his account is compared with parallels in classical literature, which were, undoubtedly, well known to many of Josephus' readers.<sup>29</sup> As to specific parallels in classical literature, we find (Iamblichus 5.7) a similar annunciation from the Pythian priestess at Delphi to the father of Pythagoras that there would be born to him a son of extraordinary beauty and wisdom. Herodotus (1.107) tells of the dream of Astyages, the king of the Medes, that his daughter Mandane would have a son who would conquer Asia. Again, there is a legend in connection with Plato (Diogenes Laertius 3.2) of Apollo's appearance to Plato's father. Likewise, as Hadas<sup>30</sup> has pointed out, the apocalyptic technique is seen in Dido's prediction (Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.625) of the birth of one, namely Hannibal, who would avenge her being jilted. In Josephus' own works, the most striking parallel is Amram's extra-biblical prayer (*Ant.* 2.210-211) to G-d beseeching Him to grant deliverance to the Israelites from their tribulations; there it is G-d Himself who answers him (*Ant.* 2.212-216), reminding him that Abraham's wife, once barren, had, thanks to His will, been rendered fertile, and predicting that the child about to be born, Moses, would deliver the Israelites from their bondage in Egypt. One thinks also of the annunciation by the angel Gabriel to Mary that she would bear a son who would be "holy, the Son of G-d" (Luke 1:26-28).

Eli was aware that the child to be born of her would be extraordinary, inasmuch as he states that Eli would not tell her that a prophet was foreordained to be born of her, "for he had heard when the L-rd spoke concerning him." Unlike Pseudo-Philo (51.3-6), who has presented at length Hannah's song of praise, elaborating on the biblical source (1 Sam 2:1-10), Josephus, presumably because he felt that such a prayer had no place in a history proper, has omitted it, even as he has omitted Deborah's song (Judg 5:1-31), which again Pseudo-Philo (32.1-17) has elaborated at great length.

<sup>29</sup> On Josephus' knowledge of Greek literature see my *Josephus and Modern Scholarship* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984) 392-419, 819-822, and 935-937. On his knowledge of Latin literature see Thackeray (above, note 6) 119-120; Benjamin Nadel, "Josephus Flavius and the Terminology of Roman Political Invective" [in Polish], *Eos* 56 (1966) 256-272; and David Daube, "Three Legal Notes on Josephus after His Surrender," *Law Quarterly Review* (London) 93 (1977) 191-194.

<sup>30</sup> Moses Hadas, "Aeneas and the Tradition of the National Hero," *American Journal of Philology* 69 (1948) 413.

Of course, once Samuel was born, in view of the fact that the Messiah is, by definition, a political figure who will establish an independent Jewish state, Josephus, as we see in his treatment of Daniel's prophecy (*Ant.* 10.210),<sup>31</sup> was careful to avoid presenting Samuel as a Messianic-like figure reminiscent of the portrait that we find in Pseudo-Philo (*Biblical Antiquities* 51.7), who describes the scene in which the people went down with one accord to Shiloh with timbrels and dances, with lutes and harps, and anointed him as they would a messianic king, and declared, "Let the prophet live among the people, and let him be long a light unto this nation."

One of the typical motifs, alike of the Hellenistic, Roman, Christian, and rabbinic<sup>32</sup> biography of a hero, was his precocious intellectual development as a child.<sup>33</sup> In his portrait of Moses, Josephus (*Ant.* 2.230), in an extra-biblical detail, states that his growth of understanding far outtraced the measure of his years, and its maturer excellence was displayed in his very games; "and his actions then gave promise of the greater deeds to be wrought by him on reaching manhood." Josephus (*Ant.* 2.232-236) recounts the tale, which has

<sup>31</sup> Josephus' excuse is that, as an historian, he is expected to discuss the past and not to predict the future, although he certainly, as we have remarked, saw a kinship between the prophet and the historian. Clearly, the reason for Josephus' evasiveness is that Jewish interpretation of this passage (cf. *Exodus Rabbah* 35.5) saw in it a prophecy of a Messianic overthrow of the Roman Empire.

<sup>32</sup> See Charles Perrot, "Les recits d'enfance dans la Haggada antérieure au II<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère," *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 55 (1967) 481-518, who has collected the haggadic materials relating to the childhood of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Moses, Samson, Samuel, and Elijah. Thus we hear, for example, that Abraham in his third year (*Genesis Rabbah* 38, Pseudo-Jonathan on Genesis 11:28) recognized that all the idols of his father were naught and destroyed them.

<sup>33</sup> One may note the examples, cited by Charles H. Talbert, "Prophecies of Future Greatness: the Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15," in James L. Crenshaw and Samuel Sandmel, eds., *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on G-d's control of Human Events Presented to Lou H. Silberman* (New York, 1980) 135, of Plutarch's *Theseus* (6.4), *Solon* (2), *Themistocles* (2.1), *Dion* (4.2), *Alexander* (5.1), *Romulus* (8), and *Cicero* (2.2); Quintus Curtius' *History of Alexander* (1), Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (1.7.11); Pseudo-Callisthenes' *Alexander Romance*; 1 Enoch 106.11 (where Noah blesses G-d while still in the hands of a midwife); Philo's *Life of Moses* (1.5.20-24, 1.6.25-29); and Jubilees 11-12 (Abraham as a child prodigy). See Ludwig Bieler, Θεῖος ἀνὴρ, *das Bild des "göttlichen Menschen" in Spätantike und Frühchristentum* (Wien: Höfels, 1935) 1.34-38; Hermann K. Usener, *Kleine Schriften* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1912) 4.127-128. The latter cites the examples of *Evangelos* of Miletus (Conon, *Narrationes* 44), Amphoteos and Akarnan the son of Callirhoe (Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* 1.7.4). See Hans Scherb, *Das Motiv vom starken Knaben in der Märchen der Weltliteratur, eine religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung und Entwicklung* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930), cited by Isidore Lévy, *La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine* (Paris: Champion, 1927) 141, note 4.



its clear parallel in the rabbinic tradition (*Exodus Rabbah* 1.26, *Deuteronomy Rabbah* 11.10), of the infant Moses who is brought to Pharaoh and who tramples upon Pharaoh's crown.

In the case of Samuel, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 2:18) states that Samuel was ministering before the L-rd while still a child, Josephus (*Ant.* 5.348) is much more precise in giving his age as twelve and in indicating the nature of his precocity, namely as a prophet.<sup>34</sup>

#### b. Leadership

As a student of Thucydides, Josephus constantly emphasizes the importance of leadership. Just as, according to Thucydides (2.65.8), Pericles was the ideal leader because he led the multitude rather than was led by them, so Josephus is at every point eager to underline Moses' importance as a leader, especially since the race of mankind, as he puts it (*Ant.* 3.23), is by nature morose (*δυσαρέστου*) and censorious (*φιλατιίου*). The details which Josephus (*Ant.* 2.203) adds to the biblical account (Exodus 1:11) of the hard labor imposed by the Egyptians upon the Israelites serve to emphasize the crucial role played by Moses in leading his people out of slavery.

Again, it is Samuel who takes the lead in searching for Saul when he disappears after being chosen as king. In the biblical text (1 Sam 10:21-22) it is his future subjects who unsuccessfully search for him. Thereupon, they inquire of G-d as to his whereabouts. G-d then tells them that Saul is hiding among the baggage. In Josephus' version (*Ant.* 6.664) when the Israelites are baffled and perplexed at Saul's disappearance, it is Samuel who comes to the fore and beseeches G-d to show where Saul is and to bring him forth. G-d then tells Samuel where Saul is, whereupon Samuel sends to fetch him and sets him in the midst of the throng.

<sup>34</sup> In giving Samuel's age as twelve Josephus is in precise agreement with the midrashic tradition (*Midrash Psalms* 25.212 and *Midrash Samuel* 1.46). Pseudo-Philo (*Biblical Antiquities* 53.1) gives Samuel's age as eight, but, unlike Josephus, he specifically says that Samuel did not at that age know the oracles of G-d. In my Prolegomenon to the re-issue of M.R. James, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (New York: Ktav, 1971) cxxxiii, I suggest that perhaps in the text of Pseudo-Philo XII was misread as VIII, though admittedly all our surviving manuscripts read *octo*, "eight." Cf. Luke 2.40, 52, where we are told that the child Jesus "grew and became strong, filled with wisdom, and the favor of G-d was upon him... And Jesus increased in wisdom and in stature and in favor with G-d and man." Josephus (*Life* 9) himself cites his own precocity, noting that while still a mere boy, about fourteen years of age, he won universal applause for his love of letters and that the chief priests and the leading men of Jerusalem used to come to him constantly for precise information with regard to the laws.

But Josephus is eager to establish the leadership qualities of Samuel and not to make him a mere mouthpiece of G-d. Thus, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 8:21) states that Samuel heard all the words of the people when they requested a king and repeated them to G-d, whereupon he received G-d's instructions to listen to the people, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.44) Samuel gives an answer to the people even before turning to G-d, when he tells them, quite confidently, to depart to their respective homes and to wait until he summons them after he has heard from G-d as to whom He chooses for their king.

Again, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 16:12) it is G-d who points out David to Samuel as the son of Jesse who is to be anointed, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.164) it is Samuel himself who recognizes David as the one whom it has pleased G-d to select as king. Likewise, when Samuel anoints David, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 16:13) is content merely to state that fact, Samuel, the true leader, uses the occasion in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.165) to exhort David to be righteous and obedient to G-d's commandments and then proceeds to prophesy that he would be victorious in war and that he and his descendants would become splendid and renowned.<sup>35</sup>

Josephus stresses Samuel's role as a leader who is concerned for the masses. Thus, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 13:11) Saul offers a sacrifice prematurely when Samuel tarries in visiting him and Samuel berates him with the words, "What hast thou done?," Josephus' Samuel (*Ant.* 6.102) shows more concern for the people when he tells Saul that he is paying a visit to him in accordance with G-d's will in order to preside at the prayers and sacrifices on behalf of the people.

We may note also that Josephus has built up the figure of Samuel at the expense of Eli the high priest.<sup>36</sup> Thus, according to the Bible (1 Sam 2:34), a nameless man of G-d tells Eli that the latter's two sons will die on the same day. In Josephus' version (*Ant.* 5.350) it is G-d Himself who tells not Eli but Samuel that the sons of Eli are to

<sup>35</sup> Similarly, in Pseudo-Philo (*Biblical Antiquities* 59.4), after anointing David Samuel begins to sing a psalm.

<sup>36</sup> Josephus has also, in general, downgraded the importance of Eli. Thus, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 2:20) we are told that Eli would bless Elkanah and his wife and express the prayer that G-d would give them children, whereupon we hear in the next verse that G-d did, indeed, remember Hannah and she conceived three sons and two daughters, Josephus (*Ant.* 5.347) has altogether omitted the role of Eli and states merely that Elkanah had by Hannah other sons and three daughters.

die on the same day; He then adds the extra-biblical detail that the priesthood is to pass to the house of Eleazar — a matter of particular interest to Josephus himself, inasmuch as he was himself a priest.

Of course, the ultimate statement of Samuel's role as a leader is to be seen in his actions as a prophet. The importance of Samuel's status as a prophet may be seen in the extra-biblical statement (*Ant.* 6.38) that in requesting a king the Israelites were not only showing ingratitude toward G-d (1 Sam 8:7-9) but also toward Samuel's status as a prophet. Moreover, when Saul is searching for his father's asses, his servant (1 Sam 9:6), according to the Bible, tells him that there is a man of G-d — that is, Samuel — in the city who may help him; Josephus (*Ant.* 6.47) here adds to Samuel's status by referring to him as a *true* prophet. Similar emphasis on the truth of Samuel's prophecy may be discerned in Josephus' addition (*Ant.* 6.92) to the biblical account (1 Sam 12:17) of G-d's response to the people's request for a king. In the latter we read only that G-d sent thunder and rain to indicate his protest; in Josephus we are told that G-d sent thunder, lightning, and hail in order to attest to the truth of all that the prophet had said.

Moreover, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 19:23) the spirit of G-d comes upon Saul and he prophesies, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.223) it is Samuel's presence that communicates to Saul the power of prophecy.

A key function of a prophet is the accurate prediction of the future.<sup>37</sup> Thus, in the biblical version (1 Sam 10:25) Samuel tells the people the manner of the kingdom, writes it in a book, and sets it before the L-rd, but says nothing about the prophetic nature of the book. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.66) has Samuel present in writing a prophetic prediction which he then, like the sihyt who presented her prophecies to the Roman King Tarquinius Superbus, who eventually bought them and placed them in the Capitoline temple of Jupiter, reads it in the hearing of the king and places it in the tabernacle of G-d.

One may well ask, however, why, if Samuel was such a great leader and prophet in the eyes of G-d, G-d did not listen to his entreaty (1 Sam 15:11) on behalf of Saul after Saul had disobeyed the divine commandment to wipe out the Amalekites. The Bible says merely that Samuel was grieved and cried to G-d all night. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.144), however, explains that the reason why G-d did not

<sup>37</sup> See my "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus" (above, note 1) 407-411.

grant Samuel's request was that, as a matter of principle, He did not regard it as just to condone sins at the intercession of another, since nothing more favors their growth than "laxity on the part of the wronged, who, in seeking a reputation for mildness and kindness, are unwittingly the begetters of crime." It is thus clear that the reason why G-d refuses Samuel's request is not Samuel's unworthiness but rather a desire on the part of G-d to protect this principle. Josephus, in another extra-biblical addition (*Ant.* 6.153), reiterates this principle, explaining that change and reversal of judgment are part of human frailty and not of divine power.

### c. Wisdom

The great hero, as we see particularly in Josephus' portraits of Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Joshua, Samson, Saul, David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Daniel, Ezra, and Esther,<sup>38</sup> must, like Plato's philosopher-king, possess the four cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice, plus the virtue of piety, which Plato (*Protagoras* 349B) already counts as the fifth of the virtues.

An indication of the wisdom of Samuel is to be found in Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 6.31) that Samuel redivided (διακοσμήσας, "put in order," "arrange") the people, assigning a city to each group. This achievement of Samuel parallels him again with Moses, who is

<sup>38</sup> See my "Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 99 (1968) 143-156; "Abraham the General in Josephus," in Frederick E. Greenspahn et al., eds., *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1984) 43-49; "Josephus as a Biblical Interpreter: the 'Aqedah'" (above, note 3) 212-252; "Josephus' Portrait of Jacob," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 79 (1988-89) 101-151; "Josephus' Portrait of Joseph," *Revue Biblique* (forthcoming); "Josephus' Portrait of Moses," *Jewish Quarterly Review* (forthcoming); "Josephus' Portrait of Joshua," *Harvard Theological Review* 82 (1989) 351-376; "Josephus' Version of Samson" (above, note 25) 171-214; "Josephus' Portrait of Saul," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982) 45-99; "Josephus' Portrait of David," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 60 (1989) 129-174; "Josephus as an Apologist to the Greco-Roman World: His Portrait of Solomon," in Elisabeth S. Fiorenza, ed., *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1976) 69-98; "Josephus' Portrait of Hezekiah," *Journal of Biblical Literature* (forthcoming); "Josephus' Portrait of Daniel," *Henoch* (forthcoming); "Josephus' Portrait of Ezra," *Vetus Testamentum* (forthcoming); "Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 101 (1970) 143-170; and, for an overall survey, "Use, Authority, and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus," in Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, eds., *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, sect. 2, vol. 1; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988) 455-518.*

praised by Hecataeus of Abdera (*ap.* Diodorus 40.3.3) for dividing the Israelites into twelve tribes. The Bible (1 Sam 7:16) says merely that Samuel went from year to year on the circuit and says nothing about dividing the people into groups.

A key attribute connected with wisdom, as we may see in Thucydides' (2.60) portrait of the ideal statesman, Pericles, is the ability to persuade. Thus Josephus remarks (*Ant.* 1.154) that Abraham was persuasive with his hearers (*ἀκροαυμένοις*, a word used especially of students who listen to lectures in the philosophic schools)<sup>39</sup> and was not mistaken in his inferences. His power of persuasion is seen particularly in his ability to convince the Egyptians (*Ant.* 1.167) on any subject which he undertook to teach. As to Moses, it is nothing short of amazing that Josephus is able to praise his extraordinary ability in addressing a crowd (*Ant.* 3.13, 4.328), despite the fact that the Bible (Exod 6:12) declares that he had a speech impediment.

When, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 6.160), G-d lists four virtues to Samuel to be sought in a ruler, one of them is the power of persuasion (*πειθώ*).<sup>40</sup> We may perceive this ability in Samuel when he addresses the Israelites. In the first place, there is no indication in the Bible (1 Sam 7:3) that he waited for an opportune moment to speak to them, whereas Josephus (*Ant.* 6.19) specifically says that he spoke to them only when he saw their ardor and determined that the occasion was opportune. Secondly, when he does speak to them, he realizes that if he appeals to them on religious grounds, as Samuel does in the Bible, urging them to give up their worship of foreign gods, he would not succeed in reaching the masses, inasmuch as many were emotionally attached to these gods; he thus in Josephus finds a common denominator, namely patriotism, appealing to their love of liberty and their readiness to sacrifice in order to attain it. It is only after he makes this appeal to patriotism that he exhorts the Israelites — and in the most general terms — to turn to righteous-

<sup>39</sup> See my "Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus" (above, note 38) 151-152.

<sup>40</sup> To be sure, Marcus in his Loeb translation renders *πειθώ* as "obedience" (presumably to G-d); but inasmuch as one of the other virtues is piety, it seems more likely that the word implies, as it usually does, the ability to persuade, especially since Thucydides, whom Josephus so admired, regarded this as a crucial quality in Pericles.

ness and to honoring G-d. Moreover, there is no indication in the Bible (1 Sam 7:4) as to effectiveness of Samuel as a speaker; all we hear is that the Israelites did put away the foreign gods. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.22), however, emphasizes Samuel's effectiveness as an orator by noting that his words were acclaimed (ἐπευφήμησε) by the people, who were delighted (ἡσθέν) with the exhortation.

#### d. Courage

The second of the cardinal virtues, courage, is stressed by Josephus in a number of additions to the Biblical narrative,<sup>41</sup> especially since the Jews had been reproached with cowardice by such Jew-haters as Apollonius Molon (Josephus, *Ap.* 2.148). Moreover, Josephus himself had been subjected to such a charge (*War* 3.358). Indeed, in setting forth, in an extra-biblical remark, the virtues which G-d seeks in a king, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.160) lists courage (ἀνδρεία) as one of four such qualities.

There is further indication of the importance of generalship in a ruler in Samuel's comment (*Ant.* 6.54), not found in his biblical source (1 Sam 9:1-8), when he anoints Saul as king, that Saul's function as king will be to combat the Philistines and to defend the Hebrews.

It is, indeed, striking that this quality should be stressed in the case of Samuel, inasmuch as it is lacking in the biblical text.<sup>42</sup> Thus, we find that whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 7:7) the Philistines—with no indication of the size of their army or of their use of the element of surprise—march against the Israelites when they are gathered at Mizpah, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.23) exaggerates the danger by having the Philistines advance with an army mighty in strength, hoping to surprise the Israelites while they are off their guard and unprepared. Likewise, whereas the biblical text (1 Sam 7:7) then proceeds to state merely that when the Israelites heard that the Philistines were about to attack them they were afraid, Josephus very dramatically (*Ant.* 6.24) increases this fear by remarking that they were dismayed and plunged into confusion and alarm, naked and unarmed. At this point, according to the Bible (1 Sam 7:8), the people ask Samuel to intercede with G-d in their behalf, and he offers a sacrifice and prays

<sup>41</sup> See my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 490-491.

<sup>42</sup> For rabbinic parallels see Ginzberg (above, note 20) 6.228, note 42.

to G-d. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.24) places the emphasis on the Israelites' loss of courage and thus explains their failure to fight back. With this build-up Josephus (*Ant.* 6.24) now places the spotlight squarely on Samuel as the person to whom the Israelites turn as the hope of their salvation. Indeed, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 7:8) it is G-d whom the Israelites ask, through the intercession of Samuel, to save them, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.24) their hope is in Samuel as well as in G-d. Samuel then fulfills their expectations by not only offering a sacrifice, as in the Bible (1 Samuel 7:9), but also, as Aeneas (Virgil, *Aeneid* 1.198-207) or Moses (*Ant.* 2.327, 3.47, 3.300-301) or any other good general would, by encouraging the people, bidding them to be of good cheer (θαρρεῖν) and giving them confidence by promising that G-d would help them. We may suggest that a possible clue that Josephus looked upon Samuel as a Jewish Aeneas may be found in the fact that he refers (*Ant.* 6.32) to one of Samuel's sons as Iulus ('Ιοῦλος),<sup>43</sup> another name for Ascanius, the son of Aeneas. Significantly, the Septuagint, which Josephus generally follows for his account of Samuel, reads 'Ιωήλ, which is a transliteration of the Hebrew Joel.

Most remarkable, in an extra-biblical remark, Samuel emerges in Josephus as a fearless general. Thus, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 7:11) we read that the Israelites went out of Mizpah and pursued the Philistines, with no indication of the identity of their leader, let alone the role of Samuel, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.28) Samuel himself is said to have rushed (ἐπεξέρχεται) out upon the Philistines with his people and himself massacred many of the enemy and pursued the rest. In this campaign, the Bible (1 Sam 7:12) emphasizes the help which G-d gave to the Israelites, whereas Josephus (*Ant.* 6.28), without denying this help, stresses the consequent strength of the Israelites. Following this, the Bible (1 Sam 7:13) says that the Philistines were subdued. Again, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.30) paints an extra-biblical picture of Samuel taking the field (στρατεύσας) against the Philistines, slaying multitudes, and utterly humbling their pride (φρονήματα), almost as if it were the climax of a Greek tragedy, and reminiscent of the pride of the Egyptians (*Ant.* 3.86) which G-d tamed with diverse plagues, as Moses reminded the Israelites.

<sup>43</sup> This is the reading of two of the manuscripts (Regius Parisinus, dating from the fourteenth century, and Oxoniensis, dating from the fifteenth century) and is adopted by Thackeray in his Loeb edition. Other manuscripts read Οὔηλος or 'Ιωήλος ('Ιωήλ).

Samuel's ability in directing military affairs is likewise implied when the Philistines mass a huge armada against the Israelites. Whereas in the biblical version (1 Sam 10:8) Samuel tells the newly-anointed king Saul that he will come to him and tell him what he should do, in Josephus' version (*Ant.* 6.100) it is Saul who recognizes the ability of Samuel as a military strategist by summoning Samuel to his presence to confer with him concerning the war and the situation (πραγμάτων) in general.

#### e. Temperance

The third of the cardinal virtues, temperance, is likewise a recurring theme in extra-biblical additions to the portraits of his biblical heroes in Josephus.<sup>44</sup> Temperance, for the ancients, was shown primarily in one's food habits; and, indeed, a major criticism leveled against the Jews by the pagan writers is that they are guilty of stubborn exclusiveness and separatism, largely because of their observance of the dietary laws.<sup>45</sup> And yet, when Aristotle, according to his disciple Clearchus of Soli (*ap.* Josephus, *Against Apion* 1.182), met a Jew in Asia Minor in the fourth century B.C.E. he was impressed with the Jew's temperance (σωφροσύνην) in his way of life (διαίτη). The Greek word διαίτα, which is here used for "way of life" or "regimen," refers particularly, as does its English derivative, to the diet. The same word, διαίτα, is used four times (*Ant.* 10.187, 190, 191, 192) in describing the diet of Daniel and his colleagues. Quite clearly the διαίτα of Daniel and his colleagues is contrasted with the διαίτα of Nebuchadnezzar (*Ant.* 10.242) when his way of living was changed to that of beasts.

Josephus stresses this lesson of temperance in connection with his criticism of Samuel's sons. Whereas the Bible (1 Sam 8:3) stresses their perversion of justice in that they turned aside after gain and accepted bribes, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.34) adds that they abandoned themselves to luxury (τροφήν) and sumptuous (πολυτελεῖς) diets (διαίτας "diets," "ways of life"). That Josephus is definitely contrasting the lavish diets of the sons with that of Samuel himself is clear from his statement (*Ant.* 6.34) that in following this regimen Samuel's sons

<sup>44</sup>See my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 491-492; "Josephus' Portrait of Saul" (above, note 38) 79-82; and "Josephus' Portrait of David" (above, note 38) 147-149.

<sup>45</sup>See my "Philo-Semitism among Ancient Intellectuals," *Tradition* 1 (1958-59) 28-30.



were acting in defiance not only of G-d but also of their own father.

Samuel's own moderate character may be seen in Josephus' extra-biblical statement (*Ant.* 6.92) that when the Israelites implore Samuel to intercede with G-d so as to forgive them for the sin of requesting a king, they call upon him as a kind (χρηστόν, "good," "noble," "friendly") and moderate (ἐπιεικῆ, "gentle," "considerable," "understanding," "generous," "magnanimous," "kind," "friendly," "peaceable") father, to render G-d gracious to them so that He might forgive this sin.

#### f. Justice

As the very subject of Plato's *Republic* justice is the capstone of the virtues. It is this quality which Josephus stresses in his portraits of virtually every major biblical figure.<sup>46</sup> The Bible (1 Sam 7:16) says merely that Samuel "judged Israel in all those places"; Josephus (*Ant.* 6.31), however, adds a good deal to this bland statement. He asserts that Samuel judged the causes of the people and continued for long to administer (ἐβράβευεν) perfect (πολλήν, "much") justice (εὐνομίαν). The identification of Samuel here with εὐνομία would remind readers of Hesiod's (*Theogony* 902) personification of Eunomia as the daughter of Themis ("Law," "Right," "Justice," "Custom"), as well as the title of a famous poem by Tyrtaeus (cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 1307a1). It is significant that when, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 7.195), Absalom, the son of David, wishes to win the goodwill of the masses who come for judgment he tells them that if he himself had had the power to administer justice he would have dispensed full and perfect justice to them; his phrase for "perfect justice," πολλήν ... εὐνομίαν, is the same as that employed here with regard to Samuel. Likewise, when David exhorts the chiefs of the people to assist his son Solomon in the building of the Temple and, without fear of any evil, to devote themselves wholly to the worship of G-d, he says, in Josephus' version (*Ant.* 7.341) that as a reward for this they would

<sup>46</sup> See my "Josephus' Portrait of Jacob" (above, note 38) 112-113; "Josephus' Portrait of Joseph" (above, note 38); "Josephus' Portrait of Moses" (above, note 38); "Josephus' Portrait of Joshua" (above, note 38) 362-364; "Josephus' Portrait of Samson" (above, note 25) 190-192; "Josephus' Portrait of Saul" (above, note 38) 82-83; "Josephus' Portrait of David" (above, note 38) 150-156; "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 492-493; and Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976) 115.

enjoy peace and good order (εὐνομίαν), with which G-d repays pious and just men.

In Josephus (*Ant.* 6.160) justice (δικαιοσύνη) is one of the four qualities which G-d tells Samuel are crucial in a ruler. As for Samuel himself, in his final extra-biblical eulogy (*Ant.* 6.294), Josephus singles out for special praise the fact that he was just (δίκαιος) by nature and consequently very dear to G-d.

Moreover, he stresses his skill in the administration of justice. Thus, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 8:2) states that Samuel's sons were judges in Beersheba, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.32) shifts the initiative to Samuel in declaring that Samuel charged one of his sons to sit in judgment in Bethel and the other to do so in Beersheba, apportioning the people that should come under the jurisdiction of each. On the other hand, in an extra-biblical comment, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.34) stresses that Samuel's sons, in their perversion of justice, acted in defiance of their father, who devoted much zeal and care to instilling even into the multitude the idea of justice (δίκαιον).

Josephus, in an extra-biblical addition (*Ant.* 6.48), perhaps influenced by the stress which Thucydides (2.65.8) places upon the incorruptibility of the man, Pericles, whom he regarded as the ideal statesman, places particular emphasis upon Samuel, as a judge, as being above suspicion of accepting bribes or gifts. Thus, when Saul decides to consult Samuel for information as to the whereabouts of his father's lost asses, he tells his servant (*Ant.* 6.47) that he has nothing to offer the prophet in return for his oracle, whereupon the servant replies that he had a quarter of a shekel. At this point Josephus (*Ant.* 6.48) himself interjects that their ignorance of the fact that Samuel accepted no reward had misled them.

Likewise connected with justice is the enormous responsibility to tell the truth. That the Greeks realized its importance is to be seen in the admiration which Herodotus (1.136) expresses for the Persians for carefully instructing their sons to speak the truth and for regarding it as the most disgraceful thing in the world to tell a lie (1.139), this in contrast to the reputation which the Greeks themselves had, from the figure of Odysseus on down, for cleverness in lying and in contrast particularly with the Cretans, the proverbial liars of antiquity (Epimenides 1). Hence, when Abraham lies to the Egyptian pharaoh and to Abimelech, Josephus (*Ant.* 1.162, 207) is extremely careful, in an extra-biblical addition, to explain why he does so. Moreover, Moses is depicted (*Ant.* 4.303) as having in no

respect deviated from the truth. Similarly, Josephus (*Ant.* 7.110) remarks that David was of just nature and that when he gave judgment he considered only the truth.

When Samuel addresses the people he simply, in the biblical version (1 Sam 12:3-4), in order to stress his honesty, asks whose ox he has taken and whom he has defrauded. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.86) expands on this theme of Samuel's honesty by having him tell the people to be utterly frank, to suppress nothing through fear, to show no favoritism through respect, and to assert whether he has done anything sinister or unjust through love of gain (πλεονεξίας) or cupidity or out of favor to others. In reply, in the biblical text (1 Sam 12:4), the people state that he has not defrauded or oppressed them. In Josephus (*Ant.* 6.87) the response is more vehement: the people cry out (ἀνέκραγον) that he has done none of these things; and then they generalize, as the Bible does not, that he has governed the nation with holiness (δσιώς) and justice (δικαίως).

One apparent stain on Samuel's truthfulness is his apparent readiness, when he goes to anoint David as king in place of Saul, to accede to G-d's suggestion (1 Sam 16:2) that, if questioned where he was going, he reply that he was proceeding to offer a sacrifice to G-d. In Josephus' version (*Ant.* 6.157) the ruse is kept vague, and we are told merely that G-d "advised him and provided him a way of safety," thus saving the reputations of both G-d and Samuel for honesty.

Connected with justice is the quality of kindness toward others. Indeed, in his final eulogy for Samuel (*Ant.* 6.294), Josephus singles out his kindly (χρηστός) nature, together with his justice, as the reasons why he was so dear to G-d. Whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 3:16-18) Eli calls Samuel and asks him to tell him what G-d had told him, and Samuel complies by telling him everything that G-d had said pertaining to the impending death of Eli's sons, Josephus' Samuel (*Ant.* 5.351) is more considerate of Eli's feelings and has to be constrained by oath to reveal to Eli the contents of G-d's remarks, since, as Josephus declares, Samuel was loath to grieve him by telling him. Likewise, Josephus stresses the goodwill and forgiving nature of Saul. Thus, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 11:13), after his victory over Nahash the Ammonite, Saul magnanimously declines, despite the urging of the crowd of Israelites, to put to death those who had opposed his elevation to the kingship, Josephus' Saul (*Ant.* 6.82) goes further in his magnanimity and offers an extra-biblical explana-

tion for his kindness, namely that it would be monstrous to defile a G-d-given victory with bloodshed and murder of men of his own race, and that a spirit of mutual goodwill was preferable. Moreover, in the biblical version (1 Sam 11:12) the people turn to Samuel to recommend that he avenge those who opposed the anointing of Saul; and it is Saul who then shows his goodwill in forbidding such vengeance. Josephus, aware that this would serve to contrast unfavorably Saul's gentleness and readiness to forgive with Samuel's apparent sternness, omits this contrast altogether.

Samuel likewise shows his kindness in the repeated references in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.143-145) to Samuel's efforts to influence G-d to be reconciled with Saul after Saul disobeys the divine commandment to wipe out the Amalekites. In the biblical version (1 Sam 15:11) Samuel is angry (*vayyihar*, presumably in the sense of "distressed" or "grieved"), but in Josephus' version (*Ant.* 6.143) he is disconcerted (*συνεχύθη*) and repeatedly (*Ant.* 6.151) seeks to convince G-d to be reconciled with Saul.

Samuel also shows greater kindness to Saul in Josephus' version than in the Bible. In the latter (1 Sam 15:30-31) Samuel accedes to Saul's entreaty to honor him before the people by returning with him. Josephus' Samuel (*Ant.* 6.154) goes even further and worships together with Saul.

Connected with the quality of justice is the virtue of showing gratitude. Thus Josephus (*Ant.* 7.111) elaborates on the concern which David shows for the remnant of the house of Saul (2 Sam 9:1), adding, in particular, that besides all the other qualities that he possessed was the virtue of being ever mindful of those who had benefited him at any time.

Conversely, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.38) emphasizes the ingratitude of the Israelites in asking for a king—a request which, G-d says, will convict them of contempt and of adopting a course ungrateful toward G-d and to Samuel's status as a prophet. Likewise, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 10:18) merely states what G-d has done for the Israelites, namely that he had brought them out of Egypt and delivered them from all the nations that had oppressed them, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.60) emphasizes the theme of the ingratitude of the Israelites in that they had been unmindful of the benefits which they had received from G-d and had rejected His sovereignty. Again, at a later point, Josephus develops this theme of the ingratitude of the Israelites. Thus, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 12:7-8) Samuel recalls

the righteous act of G-d in bringing forth their ancestors from Egypt, Josephus' Samuel (*Ant.* 6.89) recalls the bondage and grievous outcry of the Israelites in Egypt and then explicitly (*Ant.* 6.90) and in the strongest terms points out their ingratitude by saying that after enjoying these benefits from G-d they had proven traitors to His worship and His religion.

#### g. Piety

That piety is coupled with the other virtues is clear from Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 1.6) that it was under the great lawgiver Moses that the Israelites were trained in piety and the exercise of the other virtues. Furthermore, he indicates the importance of piety when he declares (*Ant.* 1.21) that once Moses had won the obedience of the Israelites to the dictates of piety he had no further difficulty in persuading them of all the remaining virtues. Indeed, it is the piety of Abraham and Isaac that Josephus (*Ant.* 1.222-236) stresses in his account of the readiness of Abraham to sacrifice his son.<sup>47</sup> Moreover, when G-d indicates to Samuel the four qualities which are to be sought for in a ruler, one of them is piety (εὐσέβεια).

As for Samuel, when, according to the Bible (1 Sam 3:10), he is called a third time by G-d, he replies, "Speak, for thy servant hears." In Josephus' version (*Ant.* 5.349) Samuel uses the occasion to affirm his complete and undivided loyalty to G-d with the affirmation that he would not fail to serve Him in whatsoever He might desire.

Samuel also demonstrates his piety, in an addition to the biblical text (1 Sam 13:11), when, we are told (*Ant.* 6.102), he pays Saul a visit, in accordance with the will (βούλησιν) of G-d, to preside at the prayers and sacrifices on behalf of the people. The word βούλησις, as Attridge<sup>48</sup> remarks, is not unrelated to πρόνοια and is used frequently by Josephus as the divine norm to which human behavior should conform.<sup>49</sup> Similarly, when Samuel rebukes Saul for not following the commandment of G-d with respect to the Amalekites, he tells him, according to the Bible (1 Sam 15:22), that to obey is better than to sacrifice; in Josephus' version (*Ant.* 6.147) Samuel adds that G-d

<sup>47</sup> See my "Josephus as a Biblical Interpreter: the 'Aqedah'" (above, note 3) 212-252; and my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 494.

<sup>48</sup> Attridge (above, note 46) 74-75.

<sup>49</sup> See *Ant.* 2.171 (Jacob) and *Ant.* 4.121, 127 (Balaam), cited by Attridge (above, note 46) 75.

delights only in good and righteous (δικαίους) men, namely such as follow His will (βουλήσει).

#### 4. Josephus' Portrait of Samuel as a Lesson in Political Theory

As early as Herodotus (3.80-83) in the fifth century B.C.E. we see an interest in comparing the various forms of government—monarchy, oligarchy, and democracy—to determine the best. Similarly, Plato (*Republic* 8.543-9.576), after describing the ideal form of government, discusses the various degenerate forms—timocracy, oligarchy, democracy, and tyranny. In his prooemium, Josephus (*Ant.* 1.5) sets forth as the goal of his work that it should embrace not only the entire ancient history of the Jews but also an evaluation of their political constitution.

To Josephus (*Ant.* 4.223) aristocracy, which for him means the rule of the best and which he identifies with theocracy or the rule of G-d and which he likewise identifies as the rule of law, is the best form of government.<sup>50</sup> Indeed, Josephus insists that it was to the

<sup>50</sup> Daniel R. Schwartz, "Josephus on Jewish Constitutions and Community," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 7 (1983-84) 30-52, is troubled by the apparent contradiction in Josephus concerning forms of government, even though it is clear, as he remarks, that Josephus had given a great deal of thought to giving a consistent theory regarding the political situation of the Jewish nation. On the one hand, Josephus designates the period of the Judges as an aristocracy (*Ant.* 6.36, 84-85, 268), but at another point he refers to it as a monarchy (*Ant.* 20.229). Another apparent contradiction arises in Josephus' designation of the period between the return from Babylonian Captivity until the Hasmoneans as an aristocracy and an oligarchy (*Ant.* 11.111), while elsewhere (*Ant.* 20.234) he refers to the government during this period as a democracy. Schwartz conjectures that the contradiction may reflect different sources, but concludes that it is more likely that it reflects a gap between the time that he wrote the early part of the *Antiquities* and the period when he concluded the work, perhaps due, he thinks, to a change in historical circumstances. We may here respond that it is more likely that Josephus uses the term "aristocracy" to refer not to a particular form of government but rather, as the etymology of the term implies, to the best form of government, which for him means the rule of G-d, that is a theocracy. Therefore, the government under Moses (*Ant.* 4.223), under the Judges, and under the high priests after the return from Babylonian Captivity is termed an aristocracy, the common denominator, from Josephus' point of view, being that the nation was in reality being ruled by G-d. Hence, the appropriateness of the term "theocracy," a term which Josephus (*Against Apion* 2.165) apparently invented for such a government. When Josephus (*Ant.* 20.229) designates the period of the Judges as a monarchy, even though he has previously referred to it as an aristocracy, he is using the term "monarchy" in the etymological sense and is stating that it consisted of a single ruler; this is not in contradiction to his earlier statement (*Ant.* 6.36, 84-85, 268) that it was an aristocracy, where he is indicating that it was the best form of government,

highest interest of the Israelites to have the best of all rulers at their head, namely G-d Himself. We see this, in particular, when the Israelites ask him to choose a king for them. Whereas the Bible (1 Sam 8:6) states simply that this displeased Samuel, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.36) explains at some length why Samuel was grieved at this request, namely because of his innate righteousness (δικαιοσύνης) and his hatred of kings; rather, he was keenly (δαινῶς) enamored (ἡττητο) of aristocratic government (τῆς ἀριστοκρατίας). When he then adds that Samuel regards aristocracy as divine and productive of bliss to those who adopt it, he is clearly thinking of aristocracy in the etymological sense and is equating it, as we have noted, with theocracy. Indeed, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.83-85) has a long, extra-biblical passage in praise of aristocracy, noting that this was the form of government of the Israelites under Moses and Joshua, that after Joshua's death there were eighteen years of anarchy, after which they restored aristocratic rule, entrusting supreme judicial authority to the bravest in battle. In connection with Saul's monarchy likewise, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.131), in an addition to the biblical text (1 Sam 15:1), reiterates that while Saul had dominion over the nations, G-d had dominion over him, as well as over the nations.

If one wonders why Josephus, the lackey of the Romans, could have had a prophet of the stature of Samuel express outright hatred for kings when the Romans were being ruled by emperors with an iron hand at this very time, the answer is that the Roman emperors during this period and for many years thereafter regarded themselves not as kings but as *principes*, "first citizens," and, indeed, kept all the trappings of the republican government. In fact, after the expulsion of the last of the early kings, the very word *rex* was anathema to them, as Cicero (*De Republica* 2.30.53) remarks. It is significant that when the rabbis (*Sanhedrin* 20b)<sup>51</sup> comment on the Israelites' request

inasmuch as the rulers, that is the Judges, were being directed by G-d. That Josephus is using the term "monarchy" in this sense is clear from the fact that he states (*Ant.* 20.229) that the period of monarchy was followed by the rule of kings, the latter being a reference to a form of government. One contradiction does remain, namely between Josephus' designation (*Ant.* 11.111) of the government of the Jews during the period between the return from Babylonian Captivity and the rise of the Hasmoneans as an oligarchy and his designation of this period (*Ant.* 20.234) as a democracy. Perhaps the solution to this apparent contradiction is that Josephus regarded the rule of the high priests—clearly the rule of the few and hence an oligarchy—during this period as having the approval of the people at large.

<sup>51</sup> Also Tosefta *Sanhedrin* 4.5, *Sifre Deuteronomy* 156, *Midrash Tannaim* 103-104,

for a king, they focus on the biblical statement (1 Sam 8:5) that the Israelites seek a king to judge them "like all the nations" and object to the implied assimilation, whereas Josephus (*Ant.* 6.30) omits this objectionable phrase and states that the people sought a king to wreak vengeance upon the Philistines.

On the other hand, the worst form of government for Josephus, as for Plato in the *Republic*, is tyranny. Thus, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 2:12) describes the sons of Eli the high priest as base men who did not know the L-rd and who (1 Sam 2:17) dealt contemptuously with the offering of the L-rd, Josephus (*Ant.* 5.339) formulates his objection to them in terms of classical political theory: their manner of life differed no whit from a tyranny. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.61) considerably amplifies the degradation which the Israelites will suffer at the hands of a king, remarking that they would be treated as chattels at his will and pleasure and at the impulse of his other passions. He adds an original reason why kings would be less concerned with the welfare of their subjects than is G-d, namely that they are not their authors and creators, whereas G-d is and that, consequently, they would not lovingly strive to preserve them, whereas G-d would cherish their care. Indeed, Josephus (*War* 1.10) says most emphatically that it was the tyrants of the Jews who drew down upon the holy Temple the unwilling hands of the Romans. In fact, on no fewer than thirty occasions in the *War* the word "tyrants" is applied to the leaders of the Jewish rebels against Roman rule. Likewise when the Israelites rebel against Moses, they accuse him of being a tyrant (*Ant.* 4.3); and this is the term with which Korah (*Ant.* 4.16, 4.22) assails the rule of Moses.

Throughout his paraphrase of the Bible one can see that Josephus is commenting on the current situation in his own day. Thus, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 8:3) says very simply that Samuel's sons did not walk in the ways of their father, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.33) uses the occasion to preach a lesson in politics, noting that these sons furnished a clear illustration and proof that sons need not be similar in character to their fathers, and that, in fact, sometimes good, honest folk are sprung from knaves, while the offspring of virtuous parents have proved to be depraved. One wonders whether Josephus may not here be obliquely suggesting that Domitian, the emperor at



the time that he completed the *Antiquities* (so *Ant.* 20.267), proved to be much inferior in character to his father Vespasian.

Like Plato, with whom he was clearly acquainted,<sup>52</sup> Josephus was filled with contempt for the masses. Thus, he adds a snide remark (*Ant.* 3.5), directed against the rabble (ὄχλος) of women and children, who, he says, were responsible for vitiating the nobler instincts of the Israelites in the desert. Josephus (*Ant.* 3.23), as we have noted, has a low opinion of mankind, declaring that the race of men is by nature morose and censorious. He describes (*Ant.* 4.36-37) the rebellious Israelite assembly, in terms familiar from Plato (*Laws* 2.671A), as a tumultuous mass with its innate delight in decrying those in authority and ready to be swayed by what anyone said. He returns to the theme of the fickleness of the mob when he speaks sneeringly (*Ant.* 6.81) of "all that a crowd, elated by success, is wont to utter against those who were of late disparaging the authors of it." Similarly, Josephus' other idol, Thucydides (2.65.4), points out the truism that the way of the multitude is fickle, as seen by the fact that the Athenians, in their anger at the terrible losses that had befallen them during the great plague, fined their leader Pericles, only to reverse themselves shortly thereafter and to choose him again as general. The ideal government, as Thucydides (2.65.9) stresses, is a government ruled by its foremost citizen rather than a true democracy which surrenders to the majority whim.

That Josephus looked upon the common people with contempt may be seen from a pejorative reference to them by Titus in the *War* (3.475), where he describes those at Tarichaeae as undisciplined, a mere rabble (ὄχλος ... ἄλλως), rather than an army. Likewise, we hear (*War* 7.191) of the mere rabble (ὄχλον ἄλλως) of Jews at Machaerus.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>52</sup> See my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 483, note 113.

<sup>53</sup> The same pejorative attitude toward the masses is evident in the fact that Josephus frequently uses the word ὄχλος in conjunction with women and children, for whom Josephus seems to have little regard. This attitude is evident in Josephus' remark (*Ant.* 5.48) that when Naia was captured a crowd (ὄχλος) of children, women, and slaves were taken. In particular, Josephus connects the act of a demagogue currying favor of the crowd with rebellion, as seen, for example, in his comment (*Ant.* 7.196) that Absalom, when rebelling against his father David, curried favor (δημαγωγῶν) with the multitude, and when he thought that the loyalty of the populace (ὄχλων) was secured to him, proceeded to plot against the state, whereupon a great multitude (ὄχλος) streamed to him. This aphoristic contempt for the mob may likewise be seen in Josephus' remark (*Ant.* 7.287) that all the people swarmed around the body of Amasa and, "as is the way of crowds (ὄχλος), pressed

In his account of Samuel Josephus likewise betrays his contempt for the masses. Thus, in an extra-biblical comment, he (*Ant.* 6.34) remarks that Samuel devoted much zeal and care to instilling the idea of righteousness (δικαιον) even into the multitude (πλήθος). This multitude, in insisting, despite Samuel's warnings of what a king will do, that Samuel find them a king, is described (*Ant.* 6.43), in a comment beyond the biblical text (1 Sam 8:19), as foolish (ἀνόητον) and obstinate (δύσκολον). Again, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 8:19) says simply that the people refused to listen to Samuel, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.43) stresses the thoughtlessness of the masses by stating that they pressed him importunately (λιπαρῶς) and insisted that he should elect their king immediately and that he should take no thought of the future.

Josephus was in something of a quandary in presenting Samuel's reaction to the Israelites' request for a king. On the one hand, we are told (*Ant.* 6.36), as we have noted, that because of his innate righteousness Samuel hated kings and was keenly enamored of aristocratic government; and yet, Samuel lacked the backbone to insist on refusing the request of the Israelites for a king. Josephus' solution to this dilemma is to absolve Samuel of blame by stressing (*Ant.* 6.37) how much anxiety (φροντίδος) and torment (βασάνου) the

forward to wonder at it." Similar negative connotations of the word ἄχλος may be seen in the following statement: "Of the impious people (ἄχλου) Azaelos shall destroy some and Jehu others" (*Ant.* 8.352); "The entire multitude (ἄχλος) [during the reign of Zadekiah] had license to act as outrageously as it pleased" (*Ant.* 10.103). Indeed, Josephus betrays his contempt for the ignorant mob in his citation of the comment of Plato, who was probably the most important single intellectual factor in the process of Hellenization in the East during the Hellenistic period (so Moses Hadas, "Plato in Hellenistic Fusion," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19 [1958] 3-13; *idem*, *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1959] 72-82), that it is hazardous to divulge the truth about G-d to the ignorant mob (ἄχλων). That Josephus is thinking in contemporary terms in his snide remarks about the masses may be seen particularly in the *War*. There we read (*War* 1.172) of King Aristobulus of Judaea disencumbering himself of his rabble (ἄχλων) of inefficient followers. Again, such language (*War* 4.107) in connection with the mob (ἄχλον) of women and children drafted by that most despised of revolutionaries, John of Gischala, is most significant. Similar disparaging remarks in Josephus' *War* about the mob of revolutionaries are found in 3.542: "The remainder of the mob (ἄχλος) [who had congregated at Tarichaeae]—a crowd of seditious individuals and fugitives to whom their infamous careers in peacetime gave war its attractions"; 6.283: "the poor women and children of the populace and a mixed multitude (ἄχλος) had taken refuge [in the Temple]"; 6.384: "the rest of the multitude (ἄχλον) [of the Jews in Jerusalem] with the women and children were sold [by the Romans]"; 7.138: "the mob (ἄχλον) of [Jewish] captives [in the triumphal procession in Rome]."

request caused him, so that he had no thought for food or sleep while turning over the matter in his mind throughout the entire night. He also emphasizes (*Ant.* 6.36) the need for a strong ruler to avenge the attacks made upon the Israelites by the Philistines. And yet, Samuel (*Ant.* 6.37-38) warns the people of the dangers inherent in having a king, since power corrupts<sup>54</sup>. Moreover, he adds to negative comments about the impositions that, according to the Bible (1 Sam 8:13), kings will place upon women by remarking (*Ant.* 6.41) that the kings will subject them to every menial task which handmaids must perforce perform from fear of whipping and tortures. Whereas in the biblical text (1 Sam 12:12) Samuel objects to the people's demand for a king when they should have regarded G-d Himself as their king, Josephus' Samuel (*Ant.* 6.88) is much more vehement and outspoken. He says that he will tell them with all boldness (*παρρησίας*) how great an impiety they had shown toward G-d in requesting a king. Again, in an extra-biblical remark (*Ant.* 6.89), he stresses that G-d had delivered them from their distress in Egypt without any king. Furthermore, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 12:11) notes that G-d sent various judges to deliver the Israelites from their enemies, Josephus' Samuel (*Ant.* 6.90) spells out the analysis, namely that it was not under the leadership of kings but of judges as generals that they had succeeded in routing their enemies. What madness (*ἄνοια*), he concludes very logically (*Ant.* 6.91), has now possessed the Israelites that they want to flee the G-d who has saved them and seek to have a king?

In view of the vehement objection of G-d and of Samuel to the Israelites' request for a king one may well ask why Josephus would want to present them in such a bad light. The answer may be found in the fact that whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 12:19) the Israelites confess to Samuel that they have sinned in asking for a king, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.92) presents them as not merely confessing their sin but as stating that they had sinned through ignorance (*χατ' ἄγνοιαν*) and hence presumably should more readily be forgiven.

The Israelites, Samuel insists (*Ant.* 6.20), ought not to be content merely to yearn for liberty but ought to do the deeds necessary to

<sup>54</sup> Attridge (above, note 46) 173, note 1, cites a parallel in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (5.71) on the dangers inherent in the appointment of a dictator, and on the likelihood, as in the case of Lars Porsena (5.21.2), that power, once attained, would corrupt as much as wealth.

attain it. Again, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.60), in an addition to the biblical text (1 Sam 10:19), emphasizes the liberty (ἐλευθερίαν) which G-d had granted them in delivering them from Egypt. Likewise, when the Philistines, according to the Bible (1 Sam 13:5-7), muster a huge army against the Israelites and reduce them to trembling, Saul, in Josephus' version (*Ant.* 6.98), sends heralds throughout the country to call up the people in the name of liberty (ἐλευθερία) to war against the Philistines. Indeed, Roman readers would recall that in the conspiracy to assassinate the mad Gains Caligula the password (*Ant.* 19.54) adopted by the conspirators was the same word, "Liberty" (ἐλευθερία). Only after making this rousing appeal does Samuel speak—and in the most general terms—of the need of the Israelites to turn their hearts to G-d and to live righteously.

### 5. Apologetics

One of the recurrent charges against the Jews in antiquity was hatred of mankind. For Josephus the virtue of humanity (φιλανθρωπία) is coupled with justice, as we see in Philo,<sup>55</sup> just as its Latin equivalent, *humanitas*, is likewise connected with the virtue of justice.<sup>56</sup> In stressing this quality Josephus seems to be answering such detractors of the Jews as the first century B.C.E. Apollonius Molon and Lysimachus (*Ap.* 2.145), who had charged the Jews with hatred of mankind—a contention repeated somewhat later also in Josephus' contemporary Tacitus (*Histories* 5.5.1), who refers to the Jews' hatred of the human race (*adversus omnes alios hostile odium*). Even Hecataeus (*ap.* Diodorus 40.3.4), who lived ca. 300 B.C.E. and who is otherwise well disposed toward the Jews, describes their way of life as "somewhat unsocial" (ἀπάνθρωπόν τινα) and hostile to foreigners (μισόξενον).<sup>57</sup> Moreover, throughout his *Antiquities* Josephus is

<sup>55</sup> Philo, *De Mutatione Nominum* 40.225; *De Vita Mosis* 2.2.9; *De Decalogo* 30.164. See the discussion by Harry A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1947) 218-220.

<sup>56</sup> Cf. Macrobius on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* 1.8, cited by Wolfson (above, note 55) 2.220, note 146.

<sup>57</sup> The Alexandrian Lysimachus (probably first century B.C.E.) reflects this charge when he says (*ap.* Josephus, *Against Apion* 1.309) that Moses instructed the Israelites "to show goodwill to no man, to offer not the best but the worst advice and to overthrow any temples and altars of gods which they found." Tacitus (*Histories* 5.5.1) remarks that while the Jews are extremely loyal to one another and always ready to show compassion to compatriots alone, they feel only hate and enmity toward all other peoples. Juvenal (*Satires* 14.103-104) goes so far as to attack

concerned with refuting these charges. Thus he notes that Abraham is moved with compassion for his friends and neighbors the Sodomites (*Ant.* 1.176); that Joseph sells grain to all people and not merely to native Egyptians (*Ant.* 2.94 and 101); that David, far from being a misanthrope, is described as φιλόανθρωπος (*Ant.* 6.304); and that Solomon asks that G-d grant the prayers not only of Jews but also of foreigners (*Ant.* 8.116-117).<sup>58</sup> Haman, we may note, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 11.212), charges that the Jews refuse to mingle with others (ἄμικτον, a term used of the Centaurs in Sophocles, *Trachiniae* 1095, and of the Cyclopes in Euripides, *Cyclops* 429), are unsocial (ἄσύμφυλον), and are in customs and practices the enemy both of the Persians and, indeed, of all mankind.<sup>59</sup>

Throughout his *Antiquities* Josephus is concerned with refuting these charges. He (*Ap.* 2.146) insists that humanity is one of the qualities especially fostered by the law code of the Jews. Moreover, says Josephus (*Ant.* 4.207 and *Ap.* 2.237), following the Septuagint (Exod 22:28), Jews are forbidden by the Torah to blaspheme the gods of others out of respect for the very word "god."

In the case of Jehu, we may note, Josephus was confronted with a dilemma, in that, according to the Bible (2 Kgs 10:27), Jehu's men were obviously less than tolerant of other religions, inasmuch as they destroyed the pillars of Baal and broke down the house of Baal and made it a latrine "unto this day."<sup>60</sup> Clearly, making a shrine of another nation's gods into a latrine would be regarded as insulting,

the Jews for not showing the way or a fountain spring to any but fellow-Jews. See my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 494-496.

<sup>58</sup> It is significant that Josephus (*Ant.* 1.241) is proud of the fact that two of Abraham's sons fought along with Heracles, the greatest mythical hero of the Greeks, and that the daughter of one of them married Heracles himself. It is likewise significant that though Josephus generally follows the Apocryphal Addition C, containing Esther's prayer to G-d, rather closely, he omits the abhorrence of foreigners expressed by Esther (C 26-27): "I detest the bed of the uncircumcised and of any alien."

<sup>59</sup> If, then, suggests Haman (*Ant.* 11.213), Ahasuerus wishes to seek the welfare of his subjects, he will order the destruction of this people. In fact, this alleged hatred of mankind had gone so far that it had even led to a blood libel by Apion (*ap.* Josephus, *Against Apion* 2.91-96) and by Damocritus (*ap.* Suidas, s.v. Δαμόκριτος).

<sup>60</sup> The word for "latrine" as it appears in the written text is *lemahara'oth* and signifies a place for a privy. It is probably related to the root *h-r-* "to relieve oneself." As it is read traditionally, the word is *lemosa'oth* and signifies a place for excretion.

and especially so the remark that it is a latrine until the present day. Josephus (*Ant.* 9.138) has, therefore, very deliberately omitted these details and instead retains only the comment that they burnt down the temple of Baal, thus purging Samaria of strange rites. A Roman, familiar with the banning of the Bacchanalian revels in 186 B.C.E., would have understood such a suppression.

As for Samuel, we may note that whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 7:3) Samuel is represented as speaking to the Israelites assuring them that if they put away their foreign gods and the Ashtaroth and direct their hearts to G-d they will be delivered from the hand of the Philistines, Josephus' Samuel (*Ant.* 6.19) says nothing about the worship of the foreign gods, presumably because the non-Jews, comprising most of his audience,<sup>61</sup> might be offended by such a reference, and instead speaks to the Israelites of liberty (ἐλευθερία) and of the blessings that it brings.

The biblical Samuel, however, seems to show a complete lack of humanity in hewing the Amalekite king Agag to pieces before the L-rd in Gilgal (1 Sam 15:33). Aside from the question of sheer cruelty, another problem with this is that Samuel was apparently a Nazirite and hence forbidden to come into contact with a corpse.<sup>62</sup> Josephus (*Ant.* 6.155) saves Samuel from this gruesome act by having him rather order Agag to be put to death, presumably by others.<sup>63</sup>

In his account of Samuel Josephus is also careful to avoid offending the sensibilities of non-Jews. According to the Bible (1 Sam 8:5), when the Israelites asked Samuel for a king they specifically requested that he choose a king for them to judge them "like all nations." As we see from Samuel's strongly negative response, he objected strongly to the idea of a king but also, more particularly, to the implication that they wished to be like other nations instead of maintaining their unique identity.<sup>64</sup> Josephus,

<sup>61</sup> See my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 470-471.

<sup>62</sup> Josephus (*Ant.* 5.344) makes clear this Nazirite status by noting that Hannah promised that her first-born should be consecrated to the service of G-d and that his manner of life (δὲλαιττον) should be unlike that of ordinary men.

<sup>63</sup> Pseudo-Philo (*Biblical Antiquities* 58.4), though he often agrees with Josephus, nevertheless follows the biblical text here in asserting that Samuel killed Agag.

<sup>64</sup> Rabbi Eliezer in the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 20b) states that in requesting a king, the elders were acting properly; rather, it is the masses who acted unworthily in seeking a king so that they might be like all other nations. See also Tosefta *Sanhedrin*

apparently, realizing that such a request and such a reaction on the part of Samuel would be interpreted as an attack upon the way other nations, presumably including the Romans, are governed, simply omitted the clause "now make us a king to judge us like all the nations." Instead, the request is put in terms of the need to wreak vengeance upon the great enemy, the Philistines.

Surely one of the most serious charges that might be brought against the Israelites by non-Jews is the seemingly cruel commandment (Exod 17:14, Deut 25:19) to wipe out all the descendants of Amalek. This would appear to be the earliest form of genocide. In the biblical version (1 Sam 15:2), when Samuel sends Saul to fulfill this commandment, he quotes G-d as saying that He remembers what Amalek did to the Israelites when he attacked them in the wilderness when they had come out of Egypt. Josephus' Samuel (*Ant.* 6.133) presents a case that would be more convincing to his Roman readers in particular, since he stresses that the commandment was to take vengeance for what the Amalekites had done to the forefathers of the Israelites; the Romans, who had such a high regard for their ancestors, would have appreciated this touch.

##### 5. "Improvements" in the Story: Clarifications, Increased Suspense and Drama

One basic reason for Josephus' writing of a paraphrase of the Scripture was that he sought to clear up obscurities in the text.<sup>65</sup> One such difficulty is apparent in the biblical statement (1 Sam 10:8) in which Samuel tells Saul, after anointing him as king, that he should go down to Gilgal and that Samuel will come to him. The implica-

4.5, *Sifre Deuteronomy* 156, *Midrash Tannaim* 103-104, *Mekhilta Devarim* 5-6, *Deuteronomy Rabbah* 5.8-11, cited by Ginzberg (above, note 20) 6.230, note 47.

<sup>65</sup> Thus it is by no means clear what G-d means when He says (Gen 1:6), "Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters." Josephus (*Ant.* 1.30) clarifies the matter by noting that what G-d did was to set the heaven above the universe and to congeal ice around it, thus explaining, as the Bible does not, the origin of rain. Another obscurity which Josephus clarifies is the "strange" fire (Lev 10:1) which Nadab and Abihu, the sons of Aaron, offered and on account of which they suffered death. The rabbis (*Leviticus Rabbah* 20.8-9), noting the juxtaposition in the Bible of the warning to priests not to partake of wine and strong drink before entering the sanctuary (Lev 10:9), suggest that they were intoxicated when they offered the fire. Josephus is unique in presenting the rationalization that they brought on the altar not the incense which Moses had commanded but what they had used previously.

tion is that Saul should go at once to Gilgal, whereas in point of fact it took a considerable amount of time before the meeting between Saul and Samuel took place there. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.57), quite clearly aware of the difficulty, has resolved it by having Samuel tell Saul to go to Gilgal "when summoned by me."

Another obscurity in the biblical text is the passage (1 Sam 28:12) in which the witch of Endor, after calling forth Samuel from the dead, says to Saul, "Why hast thou deceived me? for thou art Saul." The reader will, of course, wonder how she was thus able to recognize Saul. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.332) makes clear the source of her knowledge, inasmuch as it is Samuel who reveals to her who Saul is.<sup>66</sup>

Josephus also tries to increase the dramatic interest of the biblical narrative.<sup>67</sup> If we ask why Josephus chose to paraphrase the Bible when it had already been translated into Greek, according to the tradition of the Letter of Aristeas, 363 years earlier in the form of the Septuagint, the answer would seem to be that he sought to make the stories in the Bible more attractive to his readers, particularly to non-Jews.<sup>68</sup>

Thus, in a series of additions (*Ant.* 1.177) to the biblical narrative, we are given a vivid picture of Abraham as a general who determines to help the Sodomites without delay, who sets out in haste and falls upon the Assyrians on the fifth night in an attack in which he catches the enemy by surprise before they have time to arm themselves. Then we are given the graphic details of his slaughter of the enemy, how he slays some while they are still asleep, while he puts to flight others who are not yet asleep but who are incapacitated by drunkenness. The Bible (Gen 14:14), on the other hand, does not speak of the time and circumstances of the attack and says merely (Gen 14:15) that he continued his pursuit of the enemy, after night had fallen, with divided forces.

<sup>66</sup> Rabbinic tradition (*Midrash Samuel* 24.4, *Tanhuma Emor* [ed. Buber] 4) also recognizes this problem, and resolves it, in a manner similar to that of Josephus, by having Samuel, through his deferential posture, indicate to the witch of Endor the presence of a king.

<sup>67</sup> See "Josephus' Portrait of David" (above, note 38) 166-167; and "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 500-501.

<sup>68</sup> See my "Use, Authority and Exegesis of Mikra in the Writings of Josephus" (above, note 38) 500-501.



In the case of Samuel, there is greater drama in the account of his birth. According to the Bible (1 Sam 1:7), Elkanah's other wife, Peninah, vexed Hannah, so that she wept. Josephus (*Ant.* 5.343) has increased the drama by omitting the vexation of Hannah by Peninah<sup>69</sup> and instead painting a picture of Hannah bursting into tears as she beholds the children of her husband's other wife seated around their mother and bewailing her barrenness and lonesome lot.

Similarly, in his account of Samuel's role in thwarting the attack of the Philistines, Josephus has added dramatic details. Thus, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 7:7) says merely that the Israelites were afraid of the Philistines, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.24) has painted this fear in much darker colors: the Israelites are dismayed and are plunged into confusion and alarm. They confess to Samuel that their courage has flagged through fear and the memory of their former defeat. Moreover, there is considerably more drama in Josephus' account of the miracles wrought by G-d in discomfiting the Philistines. Whereas the Bible (1 Sam 7:10) declares that G-d sent a great thunder against the Philistines, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.27) has added to the terror by describing the fiery lightning which He flashed around them, "as it were to burn out their eyes," and by remarking that He struck the weapons from their hands and so turned them weaponless to flight. He has likewise added an earthquake, which he describes very graphically as "rocking and making tremulous and treacherous the ground beneath them, so that from its reeling their footsteps staggered and at its parting they were engulfed in sundry of its chasms."

There is likewise increased drama in Josephus' account of Samuel's appointment of Saul as king. In the Bible (1 Sam 9:15) it is during the day that G-d appears to Samuel to reveal the forthcoming visit of Saul. In Josephus (*Ant.* 6.37-40), as in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* (56.3), the scene is more dramatic, in that it is during the night that G-d appears to Samuel. Furthermore, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 9:12) we are told that the people will not eat until Samuel arrives and blesses the sacrifice, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.48) the event is much more glamorous, inasmuch as Samuel is depicted as being the actual host of a feast at which he is entertaining many. Moreover, the feast itself is more dramatic in Josephus, inasmuch as, whereas in the Bible (1 Sam 9:20) there are only about thirty persons present, in

<sup>69</sup> Though Pseudo-Philo frequently parallels Josephus, here (50.1-2), in contrast to Josephus, he represents Peninah as reproaching Hannah every day.

Josephus (*Ant.* 6.52) not only is the number increased, but, significantly, whereas the Septuagint states that there were about seventy men, Josephus has precisely seventy, clearly implying a comparison with the seventy elders who assisted Moses (Num 11:24) and of the seventy-one members of the Sanhedrin of Josephus' own day.

Again, there is increased drama in Josephus' account of Samuel's protest against the Israelites' demand for a king. In the Bible (1 Sam 12:17) Samuel calls upon G-d to indicate his displeasure with the people's demand, and we are told that G-d sent thunder and rain on that day. In Josephus' version (*Ant.* 6.92) G-d acts not only on that day but immediately, and he sends not only thunder but lightning and hail.

One of the ways in which Josephus heightens interest in his narrative is by increasing suspense. In particular, there are several instances of added suspense in Josephus' versions of the Joseph,<sup>70</sup> Esther<sup>71</sup> and Daniel narratives.<sup>72</sup> In the case of Samuel, whereas in

<sup>70</sup> In the case of Joseph, for example, whereas in the Bible (Gen 37:11) we learn merely that the brothers envied Joseph, Josephus (*Ant.* 2.12) says that the brothers understood that Joseph's dreams predicted that he would exercise power and majesty and supremacy over them; however, the brothers revealed nothing of this to Joseph, pretending that the dreams were unintelligible to them. There is likewise considerable build-up of suspense in Josephus' version of the search for Joseph's cup in the sacks of his brothers. In the Bible (Gen 44:11-12) each of the brothers, we are told, opened his sack, and the search proceeded from the oldest to the youngest; Josephus (*Ant.* 2.133) adds to this narrative by describing the feeling of relief that each felt when the cup was not found in his sack.

<sup>71</sup> There is a heightening of dramatic suspense in Josephus' introduction of Harbonah at an earlier point than he appears in the Biblical narrative. In the Bible it is not until Haman has been pointed out by Esther as the one who sought to destroy her people that Harbonah remarks (Esth 7:9) that Haman had also built gallows for Mordecai; and the king thereupon orders Haman to be hanged thereon. In Josephus (*Ant.* 11.261) Harbonah, one of Esther's eunuchs sent to hasten Haman's coming to the banquet, notices the gallows, learns that they ironically have been prepared for the queen's uncle Mordecai, and for the time being holds his peace. As an instrument of storytelling such a detail builds up suspense, and Harbonah's later revelation is therefore all the more effective. See my "Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther" (above, note 38) 153.

<sup>72</sup> Thus there is added drama in Josephus' version of Daniel's request that the execution of the wise men be delayed. In the Bible (Dan 2:16) Daniel asks the king to give him "time." In Josephus' version (*Ant.* 10.198) the drama is increased in that he asks merely for one night and, furthermore, in that Nebuchadnezzar, we are told, actually orders the execution to be postponed until he learns what Daniel has promised to disclose. One is reminded of Medea's request to Creon (Euripides, *Medea* 340-341) to allow her to remain in Corinth for just one day so that she might consider where to live in her exile and where to seek support for her children. Another case where Josephus builds up suspense is the scene where Belshazzar

the Bible (1 Sam 7:10), we read that the Philistines drew near to battle against the Israelites as Samuel was offering up a burnt-offering, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.26) has increased the suspense considerably with his version, namely, that as the victim was still upon the altar and G-d had not yet wholly consumed it through the sacred flame, the enemy forces entered the Israelites' camp and drew up for battle, expectant of victory, thinking that they had caught the Israelites offguard, without arms, with no expectation of battle, and in a hopeless plight.

There is also increased suspense in Josephus' account of Samuel's choice of Saul as king. In the Bible (1 Sam 9:15-16) G-d explicitly tells Samuel that on the following day at about that time a man will come from the tribe of Benjamin whom he is to anoint. Josephus (*Ant.* 6.49) builds up the suspense by adding that the reason why Samuel had assembled so many to his feast was that he had been praying daily to G-d to reveal to him whom He would make king. There is further suspense in that, whereas the Bible (1 Sam 9:14) states that Samuel went out toward Saul and his servant, in Josephus (*Ant.* 6.49) Samuel is seated upon a housetop anxiously awaiting the precise time when G-d had promised that the man would arrive whom he was to anoint as king.

## 6. Summary

The importance of the prophets for Josephus may be seen in the fact that he introduces the word "prophet" or "prophecy" 169 times where it is not present in the biblical original. Josephus saw a kinship between the prophets and himself as historian in analyzing the past, interpreting the present, and predicting the future. For both the criterion is truth. He also connects his own gift for prophecy with his status as a priest.

seeks to find the interpretation of the handwriting on the wall. In the biblical version (Dan 4:7, 9) the king calls upon his wise men, but they fail to understand the writing. In Josephus (*Ant.* 10.236) there are two stages, the first when the Magi are called in and the second when he offers a third of his realm to the successful interpreter. In the second stage, as Josephus reports it, the Magi come in ever greater numbers and make ever greater efforts, all without success. There is further suspense when Belshazzar's queen begs him to send for Daniel and so condemn the ignorance of those who cannot read the writing on the wall. Josephus (*Ant.* 10.238) helps build up the suspense of dire foreboding with an unscriptural detail, namely that the queen asks her husband to call for Daniel even though "a dark (*σκυθρωπόν*) outlook may be indicated by G-d."

That Samuel was of particular interest to Josephus may be seen from the fact that he devotes more space to him, relative to the biblical original, than to any other prophet. It is particularly striking that whereas the Bible refers to Samuel as a prophet only once, Josephus refers to him as a prophet or as prophesying on forty-five occasions. Apparently, Samuel did not have the drawbacks of Elijah, who, as a zealot, was embarrassing to Josephus, or of Daniel, whose prophecy of the overthrow of the Roman Empire must have made Josephus, the lackey of the Romans, rather squeamish. Hence, it is not surprising that he has a much longer encomium for Samuel than for Elijah or Daniel. Josephus has dramatized, to a greater degree than the Bible, the annunciation of the birth of Samuel, but he is careful to avoid presenting him as a messianic-like figure, such as is painted by his presumed contemporary, Pseudo-Philo in his *Biblical Antiquities*.

Josephus also emphasizes Samuel's quality of leadership in searching for Saul when he disappears after being chosen as king. In Josephus' version, moreover, Samuel is not a mere mouthpiece or tool of G-d, and he is not subordinated to Eli the high priest. As a true leader, he is concerned for the masses. His leadership is seen particularly in his role as a prophet, especially in predicting the future accurately.

Like Josephus' portrayals of other biblical heroes, Samuel is presented as possessing the four cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice, together with the fifth virtue of piety. His wisdom is seen particularly in his power of persuasion, a quality that was a key to the success of Pericles, the leader whom Thucydides, Josephus' model as a historian, admired so much. His ability and courage as a general, as well as his power to encourage the Israelite army, are especially remarkable when they are compared with his biblical source.

Josephus also stresses Samuel's moderate character and especially his temperance as compared with the lack of this quality in his sons' diets. Moreover, Josephus emphasizes that Samuel administered perfect justice, again in contrast with the perversion of justice by his sons. He stresses his incorruptibility, another quality which Thucydides emphasized in his portrayal of Pericles. The one case where G-d seems to advise Samuel to be less than honest is kept vague in Josephus, thus saving the reputation of both G-d and Samuel. Connected with justice is the quality of kindness, which Samuel

shows in trying unceasingly to influence G-d to forgive Saul for his disobedience of the divine command to exterminate the Amalekites. As for piety, Samuel affirms his complete and undivided loyalty to G-d.

Josephus uses the narrative of Samuel to present his political philosophy, particularly as to the best government, which he equates with theocracy. The worst form of government, for Josephus as for Plato, whom he much admired, is tyranny. Again like Plato, he shows contempt for the masses.

Additionally, Josephus uses the occasion to answer anti-Jewish charges, particularly that the Jews were guilty of hating non-Jews, their religion, and their ways. Thus, whereas in the Bible Samuel objects strongly to the Israelite request for a king to judge them as kings of other nations, Josephus, realizing that such a reaction on the part of Samuel might be construed as a criticism of the governments of other nations, omits this part of the request.

Josephus seeks to improve the quality of the biblical narrative by clearing up an obscurity such as how the witch of Endor was able to recognize the identity of Saul. Furthermore, Josephus increases the dramatic interest of the story, especially in his accounts of Samuel's birth and of his success in overcoming the attack of the Philistines and in his version of the choice of a king and of Samuel's consequent protest. Finally, there is increased suspense in Josephus' narrative, especially in his account of Samuel's choice of Saul as king.

# 'AMAL AND 'IBTIDĀ' IN MEDIEVAL ARABIC GRAMMATICAL TRADITION\*

BY

YISHAI PELED

## 1. The theory of the 'āmil and the concept of 'ibtidā'

As is well known, the concept of 'amal figures as a fundamental principle already in the writings of the earliest Arab grammarians. Yet, one must appreciate that the rich and highly elaborate system, often referred to as the theory of the 'āmil, was developed over centuries of uninterrupted grammatical activity.

Most of the medieval Arab grammarians, right from the earliest period, conceived of 'amal as a uni-directional process of government involving an 'A(mil) and a M(a'mūl)<sup>1</sup>. This may be formally represented as:

$$'Ā \longrightarrow M$$

where *M* normally represents a nominal (or otherwise an 'imperfect' verb), and 'Ā is either a verb or a particle governing, or operating on (*ya'malu fī*), *M* by assigning it case. Each nominal may be operated upon by one 'Ā only (for discussion, see Owens, 42-5).

For example, in

(1) *ḍaraba 'abdu - llāhi ṣaydan* — "Abdallāh hit Zayd"

*ḍaraba* is normally presented as an 'Ā operating on both 'abdu -llāhi and *ṣaydan*, assigning *raf'* case to the former and *naṣb* to the latter (for a detailed discussion, see Owens, ch. 2).

\* This is an enlarged version of a paper presented at the Second Israeli Symposium on the Arab Grammatical Tradition held at the University of Haifa, November 20-21, 1990. I wish to thank the participants for valuable comments and suggestions. The responsibility for the views expressed in the present article is, however, mine alone.

<sup>1</sup> Two outstanding 'dissidents' are Ibn Maḍā' (*al-Radd 'alā l-nuḥāh*) and, to a lesser extent, Ibn Jinnī (e.g. *Xaṣā'is* I, 109-110), who rejected the very notion of 'amal, largely on theologico-philosophical grounds.

This standard theory of the 'Ā could thus handle a large number of sentence-types in Arabic. But the medieval grammarians, especially in later periods marked by a growing tendency towards standardization of the Arabic grammar, came to demand more of the 'Ā-theory. They strove to generalize it over all cases displaying inflectional ('i'rāb) markers (case-endings on nominals and mood-endings on imperfect verbs). In other words, 'i'rāb must, by definition, be realized by government exercised upon *M* by some external 'Ā. An obvious difficulty presented itself when they had to deal with the cardinal 'ibtidā' construction:

(2) *ṣaydun qā'imun* — "Zayd is standing."

The suffix *-un* in each of the two nouns, conceived of as 'i'rāb marker, had to be accounted for by some 'Ā (Ibn Ya'īs I, 83-4). But what 'Ā could be posited in cases like these? As in other problematic cases, later grammarians had recourse to Sībawayhi's *al-Kitāb*, their model source. Now, in his *bāb al-ibtidā'* (I, 239), Sībawayhi argues that in cases like (2) the *mabnī* 'alayhi (predicate) "*yartaḥī'u bihi* [i.e. the *mubtada'*] *ka-mā-rtaḥā'a huwa* [i.e. the *mubtada'*] *bi-l-i-btidā'*." The very expression 'irtaḥā'a...bi- was taken by later grammarians to mean that in sentences like (2) there is a specific, if covert, 'Ā operating on the subject, assigning it the *raf'* case. Indeed, the grammarians did not have to rely solely on Sībawayhi's *bāb al-ibtidā'* which, while characterizing the *mubtada'* and the *ṣabar* in a nominal sentence, hardly provides a clear definition of the concept of 'ibtidā'. In other places in the *Kitāb*, 'ibtidā' is explicitly presented by Sībawayhi as a kind of 'Ā (e.g. I, 52, 18: "*fa-l-āmilu fīhi l-i-btidā'u*"; 56, 8; 100, 14). In the theory that subsequently developed, 'ibtidā' was characterized as an 'Ā *ma'nawī*, that is, an abstract operator, as opposed to the overt operator ('Ā *lafẓī*), a function normally performed by a verb or a particle (cf. Levin, *Musnad* 159, n. 124). But the crucial question was what exactly such an abstract 'Ā constitutes. On this point the grammarians differed. Zajjājī (*Jumal*, 48) maintains that in (2) *ṣaydun* is assigned the *raf'* case because of its resemblance to the *fā'il*. In support of his analogy between the two, he argues that both perform the function of a subject that requires, and is required by, a predicate (*ṣabar* in the case of the *mubtada'*, and *fi'l* in the case of the *fā'il* — for discussion, see Goldenberg, especially section I). So it is this resemblance of the *mubtada'* to the *fā'il* that constitutes the abstract 'Ā,

designated *'ibtidā'* (cf. Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 541-2, 544, for the position of the *mubtada'* as an indispensable (*'umdaḥ*) part of the sentence.<sup>2</sup>

However, most of the medieval Arab grammarians regarded the very absence of a verb/particle operating on the *mubtada'* as accountable, if only partially, for the *raf'* ending of *ḥayḍun* in *ḥayḍun qā'imun*. The predominant view was that the operator upon the *mubtada'*, the *'ibtidā'*, consists of both the absence of a morphologically realized *'Ā* (*'Ā lafẖī*) and the function of the *mubtada'* as subject to which a predicate (*xabar*) is assigned so as to form a complete grammatical sentence (cf. Levin, *Musnad* 160, and p. 163 below).

The argument attributing the *raf'* of the *mubtada'* to the fact that the *mubtada'* forms part of an *'isnād* construction is consistent with Sībawayhi's account of the *raf'* of *'abdu-llāhi* in *'abdu-llāhi munṭaliquḥ*:

*'irtafa'a 'abdu-llāhi li-'annahu ḍukira li-yubnā 'alayhi l-munṭaliqu* (I, 239)  
—“*'Abdu-llāhi* was assigned the *raf'* case, because it was uttered so that *munṭaliquḥ* could be construed with it as predicate.”

Indeed, some of the grammarians maintained that the absence of an *'Ā lafẖī* is conditioned on *'isnād*, arguing that the absence of a morphologically realized operator could not in itself count as *'Ā*, for the absence of an object cannot as such affect another object (see, e.g. Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 535)<sup>3</sup>.

However, this last argument can by no means be presented as a universally accepted principle. Some grammarians do propound the absence of an *'Ā lafẖī* as the sole explanation for the *raf'* of the *mubtada'* (see, e.g. Ibn 'Aqīl I, 201; Ibn al-Anbārī I, 46). Indeed they advocate a zero-*'Ā*, contending that the absence of a property could be used as a marker. For illustration they indicate that if you have two pieces of [uncoloured] garment, and you want to make them

<sup>2</sup> In a similar vein the grammarians normally attribute the *raf'* ending -*u* in *yaqtulu* to the fact that the 'indicative' forms as a rule fill the position of a noun (e.g. Sībawayhi I, 363-4; Suyūṭī II, 242 f.; but cf. n. 4 below).

<sup>3</sup> For the definition of *'ibtidā'* as an *'Ā* consisting of both the absence of an *'Ā lafẖī* and *'isnād*, see, e.g. Ibn al-Sarrāj I, 58; Jurjānī I, 213; Ibn 'Uṣfūr I, 340; Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 535; Ibn Ya'īs I, 83 f.; Abū Ḥayyān, 38; and cf. Levin, *Distinction* 123, and p. 163 below.

The Kūfan grammarians are noted for propounding a bi-directional *'amal* in the case of *'ibtidā'* (i.e., the *mubtada'* assigns the *raf'* case to the *xabar* and vice versa; see, e.g. Ibn Ya'īs I, 84; Ibn al-Anbārī I, 44 ff.; and cf. Owens 52-3; For Sībawayhi's expression "*'amila ba'ḍuhu fī ba'ḍin*" in related cases, see Sībawayhi I, 99, 17; 176, 7; 409, 19; and cf. 394, 15, and pp. 153 and 164 below).



distinct from one another by colouring the one and leaving the other one uncoloured, then avoiding colouring has the same distinctive effect as colouring (Ibn Ya'īš I, 84; Ibn al-Anbārī I, 46<sup>4</sup>. For these grammarians, 'Ā *ma'nawī* is equivalent to 'Ā ∅ which they regard as the essence of 'ibtidā'<sup>5</sup>. Obviously, to these grammarians, 'ibtidā' as 'Ā *ma'nawī* is an external operator much like an 'Ā *lafẓī*.

This is how the standard 'A-theory was extended so as to embrace the cardinal 'ibtidā' construction *ẓaydun qā'imun*. In the following pages I will present further examples demonstrating the grammarians' attempt at accommodating various constructions incorporating the 'ibtidā' configuration 'x is y' within the 'Ā-theory. As I hope to show, this strategy confronted the grammarians with serious theoretical problems, and the procedures adopted for solving these problems had a remarkable influence on the development and shaping of the medieval Arabic grammatical theory in its entirety.

## 2. Nawāsix al-ibtidā'

The principle stating that 'ibtidā' constructions are realized by an 'Ā *ma'nawī* soon proved problematic to the medieval 'Ā-theory. Already Sībawayhi (I, 6) observed that the 'ibtidā' construction '*abdu-llāhi munṭaliqun* is subject to government by external overt '*awāmil* such as *kāna* and *ra'ā*. In such cases, Sībawayhi maintains, there is no 'ibtidā', and the original *mubtada'* ('*abdu-llāhī*) is no longer a *mubtada'*. It is apparently on this observation that later grammarians base their presentation of sentences such as:

- (3) a. *ẓanantu ẓaydan qā'imān* — "I thought Zayd was standing."  
 b. *kāna ẓaydun qā'imān* — "Zayd was standing."  
 c. '*inna*<sup>6</sup> *ẓaydan qā'imun* — "Zayd is standing."

The medieval Arab grammarians fully appreciated that *ẓaydun qā'imun* is incorporated as an 'ibtidā' construction in sentences (3)a-c.

<sup>4</sup> Similarly, a Baṣran reply to a Kūfan argument that "*al-ta'arrī 'an al-'awāmil al-lafẓiyyah*" could not as such count as 'Ā, is that the Kūfans must accept the notion of *al-ta'arrī*, just as they accept it in the case of *yaqtulu* forms, where they claim that the -u suffix should be accounted for by the absence of a *nāṣib* or *jāzim* (Ibn al-Anbārī I, 49; Suyūṭī II, 242 f.; but cf. n. 2 above).

<sup>5</sup> For the view attributing the *raf'* of *ẓaydun* in *ẓaydun qāma 'axūhu* to the resumptive pronoun -hu in '*axūhu*, see Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣā'is* I, 18, 199; and cf. n. 19 below.

<sup>6</sup> Note that '*inna* is not mentioned by Sībawayhi in this connection, apparently because he had a rather different account of the 'behaviour' of this particle (I, 241).

Elements belonging to the categories of *'inna*, *kāna* and *ʔanna* are conceived of and presented throughout as operators that enter into *'ibtidā'* constructions (“*‘awāmil tadẖulu ‘alā l-mubtada’ wa-l-xabar*” —see, e.g. Jurjānī I, 397). However, since no more than one *‘Ā* is admitted for each nominal, the *'ibtidā'* as an *‘Ā* in each of (3)a-c is described as *replaced* by an overt *‘Ā* determining the case of *ʔayd* and *qā'im*, without affecting the *mubtada'*: *xabar* relationship obtaining between these two nominals (cf. Owens, 55-6). These *‘awāmil* are called by some of the later grammarians *nawāsīx al-ibtidā'* (‘cancellers’ of *'ibtidā'* —see Carter, 206-7; Ibn 'Aqīl I, 262; Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 432). They are often presented as modifiers ‘added’ to the *'ibtidā'* construction in order to indicate time (in the case of *kāna*) or uncertainty (*ʕakk*) in respect of the validity of the proposition (in the case of *ʔanantu*, e.g. Sībawayhi I, 337-8).

### 3. The concept of *'ilgā'*

As we have seen, once the concept of *nawāsīx al-ibtidā'* was introduced into the *‘Ā*-theory, the case endings in (3)a-c could easily be accounted for by the government exercised by the verb/particle heading each of these sentences. Let us now turn to some other cases that posed a more serious problem to the *‘Ā*-theory. It was already recognized by Sībawayhi that in certain Arabic sentence-types a transitive verb occurs concomitantly with an *'ibtidā'* construction exhibiting *raf'* endings, where the *raf'* case cannot be accounted for by government exercised by the verb. Consider the following sentences:

- (4) a. *ʔaydun ʔanantu qā'imun*  
       b. *ʔaydun qā'imun ʔanantu*

The verb *ʔanantu* occurs in (4)a-b as in (3)a, and in all three cases *ʔayd* and *qā'im* unmistakably form an *'ibtidā'* construction. Yet, unlike (3)a, in (4)a-b, where both *ʔaydun* and *qā'imun* display the *raf'* ending, *ʔanantu* does not appear to exercise any sort of government upon either nominal. In order to accommodate cases like (4) within their grammar, the medieval grammarians had to extend the *‘Ā*-theory further. The device designed to deal with such cases was *'ilgā'* neutralization of government—see Carter, 414; Owens, 50-51).

Significantly, the phenomenon of *'ilgā'* is associated with (though not restricted to) what the grammarians termed *ʔanantu wa-‘axawātuhā* (sometimes referred to by modern writers as ‘verbs of cognition’).

Ibn Yaʿīš (VII, 84) explains that verbs belonging to this category encode actions which do not affect the patient (*“ḡayr muʿattirab”*); their *ʿamal* is therefore weak<sup>7</sup>, and so they may occur in non-initial position, in which case their government is optionally neutralized; when this happens, they become *mulḡan* (occasionally *laḡn*—see Fleischer I, 545).

Indeed, the grammarians took great pains to explain this option of neutralization of government. They conceived of sentences like (4)b as representing an initial *ʿibtidāʿ* construction (*ḡaydun qāʿimun*) encoding a statement which the speaker intends to utter with certainty (*yaqīn*), but that is then modified by a verb (*ḡanantu*) encoding uncertainty (*ṣakke*) (see, e.g. Sībawayhi I, 49; Ibn Yaʿīš VII, 85). The verb in such cases is almost invariably presented as performing an adverbial function in the periphery of an *ʿibtidāʿ* sentence (e.g. Ibn Yaʿīš VII, 85). Jurjānī (I, 498) goes as far as explicitly restricting the option of *ʿilḡāʿ* to cases where the verb could be converted into a verbal noun in an adverbial prepositional phrase. Thus he regards sentence (4)a as acceptable, because it is paraphrasable by

(4) a'. *ḡaydun qāʿimun fī ḡannī*;

but he rejects the use of *ʿaʿā* in similar cases, on the ground that

(4) a''. *ḡaydun dirhamun fī ʿiʿāʿi*

is inadmissible.

Considering the subject of *ʿilḡāʿ* with reference to the *ʿĀ*-theory, Jurjānī (I, 497) maintains that in cases like (4)b

*ʿidā lafaḡta l-juzʿayni qabla l-fiʿli kāna l-ibtidāʿu ʿaqraba ʿilayhimā min-a l-fiʿli wa-awlā l-ʿāmilayni l-ʿaqrabu* — “If you utter the two parts [i.e. nominals] before the verb, then the *ʿibtidāʿ* is nearer to them than the verb, and of two operators the nearer is the more appropriate.”

In Jurjānī's view, then, the government of the verb in cases like (4)b is neutralized in favour of the government of *ʿibtidāʿ*, due to the proximity of the latter to *ḡayd*. He then turns to cases like (4)a, claiming that when the verb occurs between the two nominals, *ʿibtidāʿ* is more appropriate as *ʿĀ* of *ḡayd*, whereas the verb is more appropriate as *ʿĀ* of *qāʿim*. Consequently, in cases like (4)a, where the verb is adjacent to both nominals, the application of government (*ʿimāl*) and its neutralization (*ʿilḡāʿ*) are described as equally appro-

<sup>7</sup> Note that in this case *ʿamal* is used by him not as a pure grammatical term.

priate. Eventually a principle was established, stating that the farther the position of the verb from the beginning of the sentence, the more appropriate is the neutralization of its government (e.g. Ibn Ya'īs VII, 85).<sup>8</sup>

However, while (4)a,b are normally regarded as respectively substitutable by (4)c,d:

- (4) c. *ḡaydan ḡanantu qā'imān*  
 d. *ḡaydan qā'imān ḡanantu*,

there are cases where 'ilḡā' is viewed as obligatory, and others where it is excluded — as in (4)e and (4)f respectively:

- (4) e. *la-ḡaydan qā'imūn ḡanantu* (Abū Ḥayyān, 92; Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 439).  
 f. *ḡaydan qā'imān lam 'aḡunna* (Abū Ḥayyān, 93).

In (4)e it is the particle *la-* that blocks the 'amal of *ḡanantu* (for discussion, see section 4 below), whereas in (4)f the negation of the verb excludes 'ilḡā', on the ground that the occurrence of *ḡaydan qā'imūn* sentence-initially would present it as a positive proposition incompatible with the following negative *lam 'aḡunna*. For further details concerning the obligatoriness of 'ilḡā', see e.g. Ibn al-Sarrāj I, 183-6; Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 441, and the references in n. 8 above.

Finally, the reader is referred to Sībawayhi's detailed discussion of 'iḡān (I, 365-7, and cf. Mubarrad II, 10-12 and Suyūṭī I, 205f.). This particle is presented as 'behaving', in many cases, analogously to *ḡanantu wa-'axawātuhā*, in terms of its capability to exercise government on one hand, and to have its government neutralized, on the other. In other words, 'iḡān cases may exhibit both 'amal and 'ilḡā', according to the position of 'iḡān within the sentence. Note, however, that the government of 'iḡān is normally exercised upon a verb, and that the constructions dealt with by Sībawayhi do not exhibit 'ibtidā' (in the sense of section 1; for the position of particles in the 'Ā-theory, see section 5).

<sup>8</sup> As a matter of fact, the degree of appropriateness of 'ilḡā' was a matter of some controversy (see, e.g. Abū Ḥayyān, 92-3). For further discussion of optional 'ilḡā', including cases where the verb precedes the two nominals, as in *matā taḡunnu ḡaydan(un) muntaliqan(un)* and *bal taḡunnu ḡaydan(un) muntaliqan(un)*, see Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 437-9; Abū Ḥayyān, 92-3.

#### 4. The concept of *ta'liq*

The cases discussed in section 3, displaying a neutralized 'Ā in sentence-non-initial position, by no means exhaust the configurations dealt with in medieval Arabic grammars (especially in later periods) under the heading of '*ilgā*'. In the following cases, the transitive verb '*alima*' occurs sentence-initially without, however, exercising any overt grammatical effect on any of the nominals following it:

- (5) a. '*alimtu la-ṣaydun qā'imun* (Abū Ḥayyān, 94) "I know that Zayd  
 b. '*alimtu 'inna ṣaydan la-qā'imun* (Ibn Ya'īs VII, 86) is standing."  
 c. '*alimtu 'a-ṣaydun 'indaka 'am 'amrun* (Zajjājī, Jumal 298) — "I know whether Zayd is with you or 'Amr."

Again, the problem was how to handle sentences such as (5)a-c within the framework of the 'Ā-theory. Obviously, they could not be presented as simple '*ilgā*' cases: they do not display an 'irregular' word-order, and the verb '*alimtu*' introducing them could not easily be described as performing an adverbial function. Remarkably, however, these sentences display '*ibtidā*' constructions containing such items as *la-*, '*inna*' and the interrogative particle '*a-*', which normally perform the function of sentence-introducers. Sībawayhi made his position with regard to sentences such as (5)a-c quite clear. In the following passage he refers specifically to cases such as (5)c:

*bādā bābu mā lā ya'malu fīhi mā qablahu min-a l-fi'li -llaḏi yata'addā 'ilā l-maf'ūli wa-lā ḡayrubu li-'annahu kalāmun qad 'amila ba'dubu fī ba'din fa-lā yakūnu 'illā muḃtada'an lā ya'malu fīhi ṣay'un qablahu li-'anna 'alifa l-i-stifhāmi tamna'uhu min ḏālika wa-huwa gawluka qad 'alimtu 'a-'abdu-llāhi ṭamma 'am ṣaydun ... fa-bādā fī mawḏi'i maf'ūlin ...* (Sībawayhi I, 99, 16ff.) — This is the chapter dealing with [a clause] unaffected grammatically by a transitive verb or any other element that may precede it, since it is a clause whose constituents affect each other mutually (cf. n. 3 above); so it functions as an independent sentence (for this sense of *muḃtada'*, see 3.1 below) governed by no element preceding it, because the interrogative '*a-*' blocks such government. For example, when you say 'I know whether 'Abdallāh is there or Zayd'... the clause [introduced by '*a-*'] fills the position of a direct object."

It is apparently this passage in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* that gave rise to the development of the concept of *ta'liq* ('suspension of government') into a major component within the 'Ā-theory. The term *ta'liq* (which does not occur in any form in the chapter from which the above extract is cited) refers to a grammatical phenomenon where

certain elements, as *la-* and the interrogative *'a-* (in the view of some grammarians, also the negative particles *mā* and *lā* — see, e.g. Ibn al-Sarrāj I, 182; Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 435) act as barriers to government. These are elements that 'have the right' to occur in sentence-initial position ("*lahā l-ṣadriyyah*" — see, e.g. Ibn Hišām I, 254, 8; frequently they are referred to as *ḥurūf al-ibtidā'* — see, e.g. Ibn Ya'īs VII, 86, and cf. section 5 below), and when they follow a transitive verb they suspend (*tu'alliqu*) the *'amal* of that verb.

With regard to sentence (5)b, it should be observed that the grammarians (e.g. Sībawayhi, 410; 422, 11; Ibn Ya'īs VIII, 66) draw a sharp distinction between the use of *'inna* and *'anna* as clause-introducers. They assert that while *'anna* is a nominalizer operated upon (or, rather, is dependent on — ("*li-*)*ta'alluqihā bi-*") by a preceding *'Ā*, *'inna* as an independent-sentence introducer is immune to government; when preceded by some *'Ā*, it occurs only concomitantly with the particle *la-*<sup>9</sup>. Indeed, it is this particle that, suspending the government of the *'Ā*, requires the reading *'inna* (rather than *'anna*) of the particle introducing the clause.<sup>10</sup>

However, this lack of government of the verb upon the *'ibtidā'* clause in sentences such as (5)a-c is normally restricted to surface structure. As we have seen in the extract cited above, in Sībawayhi's view, this clause is "*fī mawḍi'i maf'ūlin*" (cf. n. 12 below). Indeed, some of the later grammarians explicitly present *ta'liq* as a special case of *'ilgā'*, in which government is neutralized in the *lafẓ* (surface) structure but not in the *ma'nā* (underlying, also "*taqdīr*") structure:<sup>11</sup>

*'i'lam 'anna l-ta'liqa darbun min-a l-'ilgā'i wa-l-farqu baynahumā 'anna l-'ilgā'a 'ibtālu 'amali l-'āmili lafẓan wa-taqdīran wa-l-ta'liqa 'ibtālu 'amalihi lafẓan lā taqdīran fa-kullu ta'liqin 'ilgā'un wa-laysa kullu 'ilgā'in ta'liqan* (Ibn Ya'īs VII, 86) — "You should know that *ta'liq* is a kind of *'ilgā'*.

<sup>9</sup> Ibn Ya'īs (VIII, 66) relates an episode concerning al-Hajjāj b. Yūsuf who once read the Qur'ānic verse 100, 11: *'inna rabbahum bihim yawma'idin la-xabirun*, with *'anna* instead of *'inna*, due to a preceding *'Ā* (*ya'lamu*). However, reaching the predicate, he found the particle *la-* attached to it, so he omitted it intentionally, preferring to be thought of as having made a mistake rather than to have a grammatical error (*lahn*) imputed to him.

<sup>10</sup> Similarly, when *ḥattā* is followed by an *'anna*-clause containing *la-*, the latter suspends the government of *ḥattā*, and *'anna* must obligatorily be read as *'inna* (Sībawayhi I, 420, 15; for further discussion, see 5.1 below).

<sup>11</sup> Some of the grammarians (see, e.g. Suyūṭī IV, 41) point out that the term *ta'liq*, denoting an intermediate state between government and non-government, is taken from Islamic jurisprudence, where it signifies the state of a woman who is neither officially married nor legally divorced (cf. Fleischer I, 677).

The difference between them is that in *'ilgā'* the government of the operator is neutralized both in the surface- and the underlying structure, whereas *ta'liq* means neutralization of government in the surface-, not in the underlying, structure<sup>12</sup>. So every [case of] *ta'liq* is [a case of] *'ilgā'*, but not every [case of] *'ilgā'* is [also a case of] *ta'liq*."

Ibn Yaʿīš then points out that, since *ta'liq* is a special case of *'ilgā'*, suspension of government is restricted to those verbs whose government may be neutralized, namely *'afʿāl al-qulūb* (cf. section 3. For the suspension of the government of *'ašhadu* in cases like *'ašhadu innahu lamunṭaliqun*, see Sībawayhi I, 421 f.; 350, 20; and cf. p. 161 below for al-Xalīl's reference to *'ašhadu* as *fi'l mulḡan*).

However, beside cases such as (5)a-c, where *ta'liq*, associated with barriers to government, is presented as obligatory, the grammarians deal with another category of *ta'liq* depicted by them as optional. These cases typically exhibit the interrogative *man* occurring within the *'ibtidā'* construction following the transitive verb. Consider the following sentences:

- (6) a. *'alimtu ʔaydan 'abū man huwa*

Abū Hayyān, 94; cf. Sībawayhi I, 100;  
Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ I, 448) — "I know  
whose father Zayd is."

- b. *'alimtu ʔaydun 'abū man huwa*

The medieval grammarians allow (6)a—indeed some regard it as preferable to (6) b (e.g. Abū Hayyān, 94)—on the ground that *ʔayd* occurs outside the scope of the barrier, and therefore may be governed by the verb. *ʔaydan* is thus analysed as the first accusative of *'alimtu*, whereas the clause *'abū man huwa* is analysed as occupying the position of the second accusative. In (6)b, the government of *'alimtu* is suspended, and *ʔaydun 'abū man huwa* is described as occupying the position of both accusatives.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> In this connection it is interesting to note that, while some grammarians include *lām al-qasam* within the category of barriers to government, this is rejected by Abū Hayyān (p. 94), on the ground that the clause introduced by *lām al-qasam* has no "*mawḍiʿ min al-ʿi rāb*," that is, it is not convertible into a nominal that can be assigned case.

<sup>13</sup> For related cases such as *'unʔur/sal ʔaydun 'abū man huwa*, see Sībawayhi I, 100; Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ I, 448-9. The medieval grammarians also refer to such constructions as *ʔanantu ʔaydun šāxiṣun* (occurring mainly in poetry), where the *rafʿ* endings of the two nouns are described as resulting from deletion of either *ḡamīr al-šaʿn* (*ʔanantubu*) or the barrier to government *la-* (*la-ʔaydun šāxiṣun*). For discussion, see Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ I, 435-6.

It should be emphasized that the interrogative particles occurring in sentences such as (6)a,b and (5)c perform the function of indirect-question introducers. Some of the grammarians (e.g. Abū Hayyān, 94-6; Zajjājī, *Majālis* 87) take great pains to explain the combination of a verb like *'alimtu*, encoding the *existence* of knowledge, with a following interrogative clause signalling the *seeking* of knowledge. They point out that the meaning conveyed by sentences such as (5)c is that the speaker does know who of the two persons is actually with the addressee. Their conclusion is that the *'a*-clause in sentences like (5)c should be regarded as interrogative in form but as indicative in meaning.

Similarly, the particles *'ayy* and *kam* occasionally introduce a clause following a verb like *'alima*, *'arafa* and *ra'ā*, conveying the meaning of 'know', 'get to know' (see, e.g. Sībawayhi I, 99 ff.; Zajjājī, *Majālis* 301-2; Šantamarī, 327; Ibn Abī l-Rabī' I, 445 ff.; Fleischer I, 677-9). Again, it is made clear that in sentences such as:

- (7) a. *wa-sa-ya'lamu -llaḏīna ḡalamū 'ayya munqalabin yanqalibūna* (Qur'ān 26, 228) — "Those who have done evil will realize what a tremendous change they will undergo."  
 b. *'a-lam yaraw kam 'ahlaknā qablahum min-a l-qurūni* (Qur'ān 36, 30) — "Have they not seen how many of the generations we have destroyed before them?"  
 c. *qad 'araftu 'ayyuhum 'abūka* (Sībawayhi I, 99) — "I know who of them is your father."

*'ayy* and *kam*, as particles originally introducing independent interrogative sentences, block the government of the transitive verbs introducing each of (7)a-c. It is pointed out, for example, that the accusative of *'ayya* in (7)a is required by *yanqalibūna* and not by *sa-ya'lamu*. (For further discussion of (7)a,b, see Fleischer I, 677-9; for the suspension of the government of *'idrib* in *'idrib 'ayyuhum 'afḏalu*, see Sībawayhi I, 350, 20).

Finally, Abū Hayyān (p. 94), in a unique argument, advocates inclusion of the particle *la'alla* within the category of barriers to government. He brings forth evidence to suggest that *la'alla* may function analogously to the interrogative particle *hal* (*la'allaka tasubbunī fa-'u'āqibaka* = *hal tasubbunī* — "Will you insult me so that I will punish you?"), and claims that in cases such as:

- (8) *lā tadrī la'alla -llāha yuḥḏitū ba'da ḏālika 'amran* (Qur'ān 65, 1) — "One does not know. Allāh may afterwards cause something to happen."



*la'alla* suspends the government of *tadrī* in a way analogous to the suspension of the government of *'adrī* by the interrogative *'a-* in:

- (9) *wa-'in 'adrī 'a-qarībun 'am ba'idun mā tū'adūna* (Qur'ān 21, 109) — "I do not know whether what you are promised is near or far."

### Excursus

Among the various examples of *ta'liq* discussed in section 4, sentences (7)a,b appear to be exceptional in that the clause following the transitive verb (with suspended government) does not display an *'ibtidā'* construction in the sense of section 1. Indeed, *'ilgā'* and *ta'liq* were conceived of by certain grammarians in a way considerably divergent from that outlined in the previous sections. The best illustration for this is, perhaps, Ibn al-Sarrāj's treatment of *'ilgā'* as a concept virtually equivalent to that of *ḡiyāḍah* (II, 257-61, and cf. Suyūṭī IV, 299 ff.). By his definition, *'ilgā'*

*'innamā huwa 'an ta'tiya l-kalimatu lā mawḍi'a lahā min-a l-'i'rābi 'in kānat mim mā tu'rābu [sic] wa-'innabā matā 'usqīṭat min-a l-kalāmi lam yaxtalla l-kalāmu, wa-'innamā ya'tī mā yulgā min-a l-kalāmi ta'kīdan aw tabyīnan* (p.257) — "*'ilgā'* is a state in which a word that has the potential to be assigned case occurs in a position that is not available for *'i'rāb* [i.e. where it cannot be assigned case]; it may be omitted without affecting the rest of the sentence, for the function of a neutralized element in a sentence is merely that of corroboration or elucidation."

Ibn al-Sarrāj later quotes another grammarian (Abū Bakr) in whose definition the neutralized element (*al-mulgā*) is neither an operator (*'Ā*) nor an operated-upon element. Ibn al-Sarrāj states that the neutralized element may be either a nominal (*'ism*), a verb, a particle, or a clause (*jumlaḥ*). As an example of a neutralized nominal he adduces the case of *ḍamīr al-faṣl*. He claims that a pronoun like *huwa* has the potential of performing the function of either a *mubtada'* or *xabar*, but when it functions as *ḍamīr al-faṣl*, preceded by a *mubtada'* and followed by a *xabar*, it receives the *'i'rāb* of neither ("*lā mawḍi'a labu min al-'i'rāb*"). For a neutralized verb, Ibn al-Sarrāj adduces the example of *kāna* in the sentence *mā kāna 'aḥsana ḡaydan* ("how nice Zayd was"), indicating that the only function of *kāna* is to mark the sentence as referring to the past (perhaps in contrast not only to transitive verbs, as he indicates, but also to *kāna* in *kāna ḡayḍun qā'iman*, where *kāna* is an explicit *'Ā*). Next he turns to the case of neutralized particles. As an example he adduces the Qur'ānic phrase

*fa-bi-mā naqḍihim mīṭāqahum* (4, 154 — “for their violating their contract”), claiming that *mā* has no “*mawḍiʿ min al-ʿiṣṣāb*”, otherwise the preposition *bi-* would not exercise government upon *naqḍihim*. Consequently *mā* must be interpreted as *ḡāʾidah*, serving the purpose of corroboration. In a similar way he explains other occurrences of *mā*, including cases such as *rubbamā* and *ʿinnamā* (see section 5). However, the above Qurʾānic phrase is adduced also by a number of other grammarians, among whom is Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ (see also Ibn Jinnī, *Ḥaṣāʾiṣ* I, 168; Suyūṭī IV, 300), who, in contrast to Ibn al-Sarrāj, attempts to distinguish between *ʿilḡāʾ* and *ḡiyāḍah*, while recognizing the close relationship between the two. In Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ’s definition (I, 442), *ʿilḡāʾ* is a state where an element does not exercise government in surface structure, yet its meaning is preserved; *ḡiyāḍah*, by contrast, is a special case of *ʿilḡāʾ*, where neutralization of government occurs concomitantly with the neutralized element losing its basic meaning. A *ḡāʾid* element is thus omissible. The phrase *fa-bi-mā naqḍihim mīṭāqahum* is then presented by Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ as a case of *ḡiyāḍah*, on the ground that *mā*, whose government is neutralized, could be omitted without affecting the meaning of the sentence. By contrast, in a sentence like *jīʿtu bi-lā ḡāḍin, lā* should be categorized as *mulḡāḥ* but not as *ḡāʾidah*, since its negative meaning is preserved.

Finally Ibn al-Sarrāj reaches the case of *ḡayḍun ḡanantu muntaliqun*, which he explains much like other grammarians (section 3). However, he extends this particular category of *ʿilḡāʾ* considerably, so as to include cases of *ʿiṭirāḍ* (parenthesis) such as *ḡayḍun — ʿaṣḥadu bi-llāhi — muntaliqun* (“Zayd — I swear by God — is leaving”). Obviously, his inclusion of *ʿiṭirāḍ* within the category of *ʿilḡāʾ* stems from his special definition of the latter (see above), as equivalent to *ḡiyāḍah*.

In Ibn al-Sarrāj’s exposition, then, *ʿilḡāʾ* is not necessarily associated with the *ʿibtidāʾ* construction (in the sense of section 1), or with an irregular word-order of a sentence containing *ḡanantu* or a related verb. Undoubtedly, his identification of *ʿilḡāʾ* with *ḡiyāḍah* runs counter to the mainstream theory of *ʿilḡāʾ* (cf. Suyūṭī I, 205-7).<sup>14</sup>

Much like Ibn al-Sarrāj’s exceptional use of the term *ʿilḡāʾ*, one may refer to Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ for a special use of *taʿlīq*. Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ (I, 456-7) claims that in the sentence

<sup>14</sup> For the use of the term *ʿilḡāʾ* in connection with conditionals and exceptive sentences, see Fleischer I, 545 and his references; and cf. Wright II, 345; Reckendorf, 498.

(10) *xarajtu min-a l-dāri* — “I went out of the house”

there are potentially two ‘*Ā*’s governing the noun *al-dār*: the verb requiring *naṣb*, and the preposition *min* requiring the *jarr* case. Since no more than one ‘*Ā*’ is allowed to operate upon any one element, it is only the preposition that governs the noun in the genitive; the government of the verb is suspended. Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ argues that the preference of the preposition over the verb as ‘*Ā*’ is in this particular case motivated by two factors: 1. the adjacency of the preposition (and not the verb) to the noun, 2. the rule that the government of a particle may not be suspended (except for special cases of *ḍarūrat al-ḥiʿr*).<sup>15</sup>

While rejecting the suspension of government of particles, Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ (I, 457-8) claims that suspension of government in the case of nouns is possible, if rare. One of the examples he cites is:

(11) *qaṭaʿa -llāhu yada wa-rijla man qālahā* — “May God cut the hand and foot of the one who said it”

where the government of *yad* is described by him as suspended (cf. Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣāʾiṣ* II, 407).

## 5. Ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ

5.1 We have seen that verbs may enter into *mubtadaʾ* + *xabar* constructions either as operators (*nawāsix al-ibtidāʾ*) or as elements whose ‘*amal*’ is neutralized (‘*ilgāʾ*’) or suspended (*taʿlīq*). Nouns, as a rule, do not govern. What about the particles? Much like verbs, particles in medieval Arabic grammatical tradition are very often defined by the type of government they exercise. Thus we find such terms as *ḥurūf al-naṣb*, *ḥurūf al-jarr* and *ḥurūf al-jaʾm*, denoting particles governing in the accusative (or the ‘subjunctive’ in the cases of verbs), the genitive and the jussive respectively.

For reasons which will become clear in 5.2, the grammarians generally avoided the expression *ḥurūf al-raʾf*. However, a common term in medieval Arabic grammatical literature is *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ*. This term appears to cover a fairly wide range of particles such as ‘*inna*’,

<sup>15</sup> A counter-example to this rule is the suspension of the government of *ḥattā* as demonstrated by Sībawayhi (see n. 10 above, and cf. section 5.1 below). Note that Ibn Abī l-Rabīʿ himself cites some examples in which he describes the particle as *mulgāb* (I, 442, and cf. p. xx above), which probably runs counter to his assertion (I, 458) that a particle always governs, even when it is superfluous (*ṣāʾid*) (but see Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣāʾiṣ* III, 106).

'in *al-muxaffafah*, *lākin* and 'id (as well as the barriers to government 'a- and la- — see section 4). The main characteristic of these particles, as defined by the grammarians, is that they do not function as 'awāmil. Their lack of potential to govern is normally associated with the fact that they may be preposed to either verbs or nouns, whereas operating particles are usually attached ("muxtaṣṣab") to elements of either of the two categories (see, e.g. Sībawayhi I, 408; Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'* 93; Ibn Ya'īs VIII, 54.<sup>16</sup>

However, since *lākin*, for instance, may be preposed to both *yaqūmu ṣaydun* and *ṣaydun qā'imun*, it follows that the expression 'ibtidā' in this case is by no means restricted to constructions of the *mubtada' + xabar* type; rather, it is intended to embrace all constructions that have the potential to occur as independent sentences. Indeed, in Sībawayhi's *Kitāb* the expressions 'ibtidā'/mubtada' are frequently used as discourse-bound terms denoting a construction, verbal or nominal, that may form an independent sentence. For instance, Sībawayhi (I, 387, 14) rejects the sentence 'in ta'tinī la-'aḥ'alanna ("If you come to me, I will do"), with 'in followed by the jussive, on the ground that

*la-'aḥ'alanna yaḥi'u mubtada'an 'a-lā tarā 'anna l-raḡula yaqūlu la-'aḥ'alanna ka-dā wa-ka-dā* — "la-'aḥ'alanna introduces [an independent sentence]; don't you see that one may say *la-'aḥ'alanna ka-dā wa-ka-dā* ['I will do so and so' — as an independent sentence]."

See, further, Sībawayhi I, 387, 8; 400, 22; 401, 3; 50, 4, and cf. p.154 above, p.161 below, and Levin, *Musnad* 149 and his references in n. 31. In later periods, the common term for this is 'isti'nāf (see, e.g. Ibn Hišām I, 137; and cf. p.164 below).

A *ḥarf 'ibtidā'*, then, may be followed either by a subject + predicate-construction or by a verb + subject-construction. Consider:

- (12) a. 'innamā ṣaydun qā'imun  
b. 'innamā yaqūmu ṣaydun
- (13) a. 'in ṣaydun la-qā'imun  
b. 'in kāna ṣaydun la-qā'iman
- (14) a. lākin ṣaydun qā'imun  
b. lākin yaqūmu ṣaydun
- (15) a. 'id ṣaydun qā'imun  
b. 'id yaqūmu ṣaydun
- (16) a. ḥattā ṣaydun qā'imun  
b. ḥattā yaqūmu ṣaydun

<sup>16</sup> Ḥaydarah (p. 226) also points out that some of the particles in question form an integral part of a word, and as such cannot act as 'awāmil. For a detailed discussion of 'ixtiṣāṣ in connection with particles, see Suyūṭī II, 245-50.

Obviously, the grammarians’ great problem with regard to cases such as (12-16), displaying neither irregular word-order nor any explicit barrier to government (apart, perhaps, from *‘innamā* — see below), was how to explain the *‘i’rāb* of *ṣaydun*. Sībawayhi (I, 408, 10) presents *lākin*, *‘innamā*, *ka-‘annamā*, *‘id* and related particles as

*ḥurūfun lā ta‘malu ṣay‘an wa-turikat-i l-‘asmā‘u ba‘dahā ‘alā ḥālibā ka-‘annahu lam yudkar qablahā ṣay‘un* — “... particles that do not exercise any [sort of] government; the nouns following them are left unaffected, as if there is nothing preceding them.”

Similarly, Sībawayhi (I, 50, 3-6) admits sentences such as

- (17) *‘ayna turā ‘abda-llābi qā‘iman* — “I wonder where Abdallāh is standing”  
 (18) *hal turā ṣaydan qāhiban* — “I wonder if Zayd is going”

on the ground that

*hal wa-‘ayna ka-‘annaka lam tadkurbumā li-‘anna mā ba‘dahumā -btidā‘un* — “*hal* and *‘ayna* [behave] as if you have not mentioned them, because they are followed by *‘ibtidā‘*.”

For Sībawayhi, then, cases like the (a)-versions of (12)-(16) display the *‘ibtidā‘* construction *ṣaydun qā‘imun* unaffected by the preceding particle, since the latter lacks the potential to govern. Similarly, (17) and (18), as well as the (b)-versions of (12)-(16), display verbal constructions ungoverned by the particles preceding them, constructions to which Sībawayhi explicitly refers as *‘ibtidā‘*. Note that in the above two extracts Sībawayhi does not use the term *ḥarf ‘ibtidā‘*. However, towards the end of his discussion of *‘inna wa-‘axawātuhā* (I, 243f.), he raises the issue of *‘innamā*, comparing it with *ba‘damā*, and then turns to *‘in al-muxaffafah* which, he claims, has the same status as *lākin*, except for the fact that in the case of *‘in al-muxaffafah* the *xabar* must be introduced by *la-* (see (13)a,b), so as to prevent the interpretation of *‘in* as a negative particle. After referring to a dialectal variant, where *‘in|‘an al-muxaffafah* is followed by an accusative noun, he concludes that *‘in al-muxaffafah*, like *‘innamā*, is regarded by most of the grammarians as *ḥarf ‘ibtidā‘* (cf. Ibn Ya‘īš VIII, 71-2. For a detailed discussion of *‘in al-muxaffafah*, see Nebes 1982, 1985, especially 1982, 8-14). With regard to *‘innamā*, Sībawayhi (I, 414, 12) quotes al-Xalīl as claiming that *‘innamā* has the status of a *fi‘l mulḡan*, analogously to *‘ašhadu la-ṣaydun xayrun minka* (“I affirm that Zayd is better than you”). Later grammarians often indicate that it is the element *mā* in *‘innamā* and related particles that blocks the

government of the particle (*mā al-kāffah* — see, e.g. Ibn Yaʿīs VIII, 34f.; and cf. Ibn al-Sarrāj II, 258.<sup>17</sup> However, Ibn Jinnī (*Xaṣāʾiṣ* I, 167 f.) points out that the ‘blocking effect’ of *mā* in *laytamā* may be neutralized (*ʿilgā*), in which case *laytamā* is followed by an accusative nominal. In the latter case *mā* is regarded as “*ḡāʾidah li-l-tawkiḍ*” (*Lumaʿ*, 93).

In contrast to *ʾinnamā*, *ʾin al-muxaffafah*, *lākin* and *ʾid*, which lack the potential to govern, *ḥattā* is normally presented by the grammarians as a particle that may either exercise government (e.g. in the accusative or genitive), or act as *ḥarf ʾibtidāʾ*, in cases like (16)a,b above. Analysing a sentence of the type of (16)a, Sībawayhi (I, 420, 14 f.) asserts that *ḥattā* in such cases is *muʾallaqah* (i.e. its government is suspended), and that the two nominative nominals are in “*mawḍiʾ ʾibtidāʾ*.” What is meant by the latter expression is made clear in Sībawayhi’s chapter devoted to *ḥattā*, where he states:

*fa-ḥattā ḥāhunā bi-manzilatī ʾidā wa-ʾinnamā hiya ḥāhunā ka-ḥarfīn min ḥurūfi l-i-btidāʾi wa-miṭlu ḍālika šaribtu ḥattā yajīʾu l-baʾiru... ay ḥattā ʾinna l-baʾira la-yajīʾu... wa-yadulluka ʾalā ḥattā ʾannabā ḥarfūn min ḥurūfi l-i-btidāʾi ʾannaka taqūlu ḥattā ʾinnahu yafʾalu ḍāka ka-mā taqūlu fa-ʾidā ʾinnahu yafʾalu ḍāka* (I, 367, 23-368, 3) — “*ḥattā* in this case has the same status as *ʾidā* (for *ʾidā* introducing an *ʾibtidāʾ* construction, cf. Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣāʾiṣ* I, 104-5); it acts here as one of *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ*. This may also be exemplified by the sentence *šaribtu ḥattā yajīʾu l-baʾiru* (‘I drank till the camel came’), which may be paraphrased by *ḥattā ʾinna l-baʾira la-yajīʾu...* That *ḥattā* is one of *ḥurūf al-ibtidāʾ* is demonstrated by the fact that you may say *ḥattā ʾinnahu yafʾalu ḍāka* (‘to the extent that he does it’), just as you may say *fa-ʾidā ʾinnahu yafʾalu ḍāka* (‘and behold, he is doing it’).”

Later grammarians were even more explicit in stating that *ḥattā*, as *ḥarf ʾibtidāʾ* is devoid of *ʾamal*, and that it introduces a clause, either verbal or nominal, that has the potential to form an independent sentence:

*wa-ʾammā l-qismu l-tālītu fa-ʾan takūna ḥarfān min ḥurūfi l-i-btidāʾi li-yustaʾnafa baʾdahā l-kalāmu wa-yuqtaʾa ʾammā qablahu ka-mā yustaʾnafa baʾdahā ʾammā wa-ʾidā -llatī li-l-muḥājaʾati wa-ʾinnamā wa-ka-ʾannamā wa-naḥwahā min ḥurūfi l-i-btidāʾi fa-yaqaʾu baʾdahā l-mubtadaʾu wa-l-xabaru wa-l-fiʾlu wa-l-fāʾilu* (Ibn Yaʿīs VIII, 18) — “In the third [construction] type

<sup>17</sup> For the word *ʾidan* ‘behaving’ analogously to *ʾinnamā*, see Sībawayhi I, 366; and cf. p. 152 above.

<sup>18</sup> For a discussion of *ḥattā* followed by *ʾin al-muxaffafah* and *ʾinna*, see Nebes 1985, 24-31; 39, n. 103.

[*ḥattā*] performs the function of *ḥarf ‘ibtidā’*, so as to mark the beginning of a new sentence and separate it from what precedes it, just as the beginning of a new sentence is marked by *‘ammā*, *‘idā* that denotes suddenness, *‘innamā*, *ka-‘annamā* and other *ḥurūf ‘ibtidā’*; so it [i.e. *ḥattā*] is followed either by *mubtada’* + *ṣabar* or by *fi’l* + *fā’il* (cf. Ibn Ya‘īš VIII, 62; Ibn Abī l-Rabī‘ II, 903-4; Ibn Hišām I, 137).

We are now in a position to argue that, in their treatment of the constructions discussed in the present article, the grammarians used the term *‘ibtidā’* in (at least) two senses:<sup>19</sup> *‘ibtidā’* I was defined as a **process** consisting in introducing a sentence by a *raf’* nominal, unpreceded by any morphologically realized operator, to which a further element is joined as predicate (*ṣaydun qā’imun*). In Ibn Abī l-Rabī‘’s (d. 688 H) words:

*al-ibtidā’u ta’riyatu l-ismi min-a l-‘awāmili l-lafẓiyyati wa-l-‘isnādu ‘ilayhi* (I, 535) — “*‘ibtidā’* means stripping a nominal of any morphologically realized operator and assigning it a predicate.”

Others, like Abū Ḥayyān, preferred to present *‘ibtidā’* rather as a **state or property**:

*‘al-ibtidā’u huwa kawnu l-ismi ‘awwalan muqtaḍiyan ṭāniyan* (p. 38) — “*‘ibtidā’* is a state in which a nominal occupies sentence-initial position and requires a further element [in predicate position].”

Or, in Jurjānī’s words:

*‘al-ibtidā’u waṣfun fī l-ismi l-mubtada’i yartaḥiṣṣu bihi wa-ṣifatu l-mubtada’i ‘an yakūna mu‘arran min-a l-‘awāmili l-ṣābirati wa-musnadan ‘ilayhi ṣay’un* (I, 213) — “*‘ibtidā’* is a property of the nominal introducing the sentence [= functioning as *mubtada’*] which assigns that nominal the *raf’* case. The nominal functioning as *mubtada’* is characteristically stripped of any overt *‘A*, and there is something assigned to it [as predicate].”

This process or property, it was claimed, accounts for the *raf’* endings in *ṣaydun qā’imun*, and should thus be regarded as an *‘Ā ma’nawī*, as opposed to a morphologically realized operator. As has already been indicated, this was a significant extension of the *‘Ā*-theory which could now account for the cardinal *mubtada’* + *ṣabar* construction, but had to be constrained by the rules of *nasx*, *‘ilgā’* and *ta’līq*, in order to accommodate such constructions as *ṣanantu ṣaydan qā’iman*, *ṣaydun ṣanantu qā’imun* and *ṣanantu la-ṣaydun qā’imun* respectively.

<sup>19</sup> As a matter of fact, the term *‘ibtidā’* is used in medieval Arabic grammatical literature to cover a variety of grammatical phenomena. For the use of *‘ibtidā’* in the sense of ‘fronting’, see Goldenberg, 68; and cf. n. 5 above.

But there were other cases which proved resistant even to this version of the 'A-theory. In order to accommodate them, the medieval grammarians developed their (already existing) discourse-bound concept of *'ibtidā'*. *'ibtidā'* in this sense, *'ibtidā' 2* (= *'isti'nāf*), was conceived of not as an 'A, but rather as a type of **clause** preceded by a particle, a clause that has the potential to form an independent sentence (*'innamā yaqūmu ḡaydun/ḡaydun qā'imun*). The concept of *'ibtidā' 2* was thus associated with *ḡurūf al-ibtidā'* — a category of non-governing particles (*"laysat bi-'āmilatin"* — see Haydarah, 217). The grammarians maintained that in cases such as *lākin ḡaydun qā'imun/yaqūmu ḡaydun* the *raf'* endings are the consequence of the interrelationship between the elements following the particle. A frequent expression in this connection is *'amila ba'duhu fī ba'din* (see p. 148, n.3); that is, the operator (or operators?) determining the *raf'* endings in *ḡaydun* and *qā'imun* should be looked for *within* the construction *ḡaydun qā'imun* or *yaqūmu ḡaydun*; *lākin* does not act as an operator, because it lacks the potential to govern. In other words, sentences (14)a and 14(b) should be analysed as (14)a' and 14(b)' respectively:

<i>ḡarf</i> <i>'ibtidā'</i>	<i>mubtada'</i>	<i>ḡabar</i>
(14) a'. <i>lākin</i>	<i>ḡaydun</i>	<i>qā'imun</i>

<i>ḡarf</i> <i>'ibtidā'</i>	<i>fī'l</i>	<i>fā'il</i>
(14) b'. <i>lākin</i>	<i>yaqūmu</i>	<i>ḡaydun</i>

In both cases *lākin* does not exercise any government whatsoever.

5.2 Allowing for minor differences, mainly in terms of the range of particles designated *ḡurūf al-ibtidā'*, the grammarians, almost invariably, seem to have adopted Sībawayhi's treatment of these particles as outlined in section 5.1. This, however, does not mean that dealing with these particles was entirely unproblematic. The case of *ḡurūf al-raf'*, a rare term covering a similar, if somewhat wider, range of particles than *ḡurūf al-ibtidā'*, illustrates, in my view, one major difficulty that the grammarians had to overcome in their attempt to characterize the particles at issue. Consider the following *bāb* title in Zajjājī's *Jumal* (p. 293):



*bābu l-ḥurūfi -llatī tarfa'u mā ba'dabā bi-l-i-btidā'i wa-l-xabari wa-tusammā ḥurūfa l-rafi* — "The chapter on the words<sup>20</sup> that govern [the nominals] following them in the *raf* through 'ibtidā' and *xabar*; they are designated *ḥurūf al-rafi*."

On this Ibn 'Uṣfūr (II, 403) comments:

*hādhihi l-tarjamatu ḡāhirubā l-tanāquḡu wa-dālika 'annahā 'idā kānat rāfi'atan fa-lā yutaṣawwaru 'an yakūna mā ba'dabā marfū'an bi-l-i-btidā'i li-'anna l-mubtada'a mu'arran min-a l-'awāmili l-lafẓiyyati fa-kayfa yutaṣawwaru fī l-ṣay'i l-wāḡidi fī ḡinin wāḡidin 'an yakūna mu'arran min-a l-'awāmili l-lafẓiyyati 'amilun fīhi lafẓun qablabu* — "This title appears to be paradoxical. For if they [i.e. the particles] assign the *raf* case, then it is inconceivable that what follows them is assigned the *raf* case as a *mubtada'*, since the *mubtada'* is [in principle] stripped of any morphologically realized operators. So how could it be imagined with regard to one element that it be stripped of morphologically realized operators and at the same time governed by an [overt] element preceding it?!"

In an attempt to solve the paradox, Ibn 'Uṣfūr suggests that *tarfa'u* in the title should be interpreted as referring to the speaker (2nd pers. masc. = you, the speaker, assign the *raf* case) rather than to the particles (cf. Zajjājī's expression *tarfa'u mā ba'dabā bi-l-i-btidā' wa-l-xabar* in relation to *mā al-tamīmiyyah*, *Jumal*, 119). But the expression *ḥurūf al-rafi*, on the authenticity of which there is apparently no disagreement, still poses a serious problem, because it suggests, analogously to *ḥurūf al-naṣb* and *ḥurūf al-jarr* (see above, p. 159), that it is the particles that assign the *raf* case to what follows them, and so the contradiction remains<sup>21</sup>.

It should be observed, further, that Zajjājī restricts his *ḥurūf al-rafi* to *ibtidā'* constructions. This emerges quite clearly from the examples adduced in his chapter, which, consistently with the expression *tarfa'u mā ba'dabā bi-l-i-btidā' wa-l-xabar* in the title, represent the *'ibtidā'* construction only.

Another grammatical work where the expression *ḥurūf al-rafi* occurs is Ibn Šuqayr's (d. 317 H) *al-Muḡallā, W'ujūb al-naṣb*. Section B22 (p. 141) in this book begins with the words: *wa-l-rafi'u bi-bal wa-*

<sup>20</sup> For Zajjājī's use of *ḥurūf* in the sense of 'words' in this particular case, see Ibn 'Uṣfūr II, 403, and p. 166 below.

<sup>21</sup> Significantly, Ibn 'Uṣfūr also points out that in another manuscript of Zajjājī's *Jumal* the word *yartaḡi'u* occurs instead of *tarfa'u*. Indeed, in Baṡalyūsī's commentary to Zajjājī's *Jumal* (*Kitāb al-bulal*, p. 333), the title of the corresponding chapter reads: "*bābu l-ḥurūfi -illatī yartaḡi'u mā ba'dabā bi-l-i-btidā'i wa-tusammā ḥurūfa l-rafi*." In another manuscript referred to by the editor (n. 1), the word following *-llatī* is *yurfa'u*.

*'axawātihā min ḥurūfi l-rafi'*<sup>22</sup> ("the assignment of the *raf*<sup>c</sup> case by *hal* and its 'sisters' of *ḥurūf al-rafi'*"), and the subsequent discussion includes such elements as the (separate) personal and demonstrative pronouns in certain constructions. This usage of *ḥurūf al-rafi'* can be traced back to Xalaf al-Aḥmar (d. 180 H) who, while not using this particular term, includes in his *Muqaddimah fī l-naḥw* a chapter entitled *al-ḥurūf allatī tarfa'u kulla -smin ba'dahā* ("the words that assign the *raf*<sup>c</sup> case to every noun following them" — p. 36), where, beside such particles as *'innamā*, *hal*, *bal*, *ḥattā* and *lākin*, which later came to be known as *ḥurūf al-ibtidā'*, he lists such elements as *nī'ma*, *bi'sa*, *dālika* and *naḥnu* (cf. n. 20 above).

5.3 Like Xalaf al-Aḥmar, Zajjājī does not restrict his category of *ḥurūf al-rafi'* to pure particles, but includes in his discussion such words as *'ayna* and *matā*.<sup>23</sup> The following two sentences occur in the list of his examples (*Jumal*, 293 ff.):

(19) *matā 'amrun munṭaliquṇ* — "When is 'Amr leaving?"

(20) *'ayna 'axūka jālisun* — "Where is your brother sitting?"

For Zajjājī, (19) and (20) are both analogous to *'innamā ḡayḏun qā'imun*; yet he draws an important distinction between the two. He points out that, whereas in (19) *munṭaliquṇ* functions as predicate to *'amrun*, in (20) this function may be performed by *'ayna*, since *'ayna 'axūka* may be regarded as a complete sentence, not requiring any continuation (*ḥasuna fībi l-sukūtu* — "it may be followed by silence"). Consequently, *jālisun* in (20) is replaceable by *jālisān*, filling the position of a circumstantial adverbial. In other words, while (19) may be analysed only as:

<i>ḡarf</i>	<i>muḡtada'</i>	<i>ḡābar</i>
┌───┐	┌───┐	┌──────────┐
(19) a. <i>matā</i>	<i>'amrun</i>	<i>munṭaliquṇ</i> ,

<sup>22</sup> An interesting point to note here is the editor's footnote No. 1 indicating that the expression *min ḥurūf al-rafi'* is missing in another manuscript of this work. A similar footnote can also be found in another version of the same book entitled *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw* (p. 167), and attributed to al-Xalīl b. Aḥmad.

<sup>23</sup> We have already seen (p. 161) that Sibawayhi refers to *'ayna* as a non-governing word followed by *'ibtidā'*. Similarly, Ibn Jinnī (*Luma'*, 93) includes such interrogative adverbials within his category of *mā yadxulu 'alā l-kalāmi fa-lā yuḡayyiruhū* ("what enters into a sentence-construction without changing it"); see also n. 20 above.

sentence (20) should be analysed as:

- (20) a.  $\begin{array}{ccc} \text{ḡarf} & \text{mubtada'} & \text{ḡabar} \\ \hline \text{'ayna} & \text{'axūka} & \text{jālisun,} \end{array}$

but is replaceable by:

- (20) b.  $\begin{array}{ccc} \text{ḡabar} & \text{mubtada'} & \text{ḡāl} \\ \hline \text{'ayna} & \text{'axūka} & \text{jālisun} \end{array}$

Comparing between cases such as (20)a and (20)b, the grammarians occasionally indicate that in (20)a the government of 'ayna is neutralized (see, e.g. Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'* 93: "ja'alta 'ayna...laḡwan"). This brings us naturally to a related construction exemplified in (21):

- (21) a. *fīḡā ḡaydun qā'imun*  
 b. *fīḡā ḡaydun qā'iman*

Indeed, Sībawayhi (I, 50, 4) maintains that 'ayna may be used analogously to ("bi-manḡilatī") *fīḡā*, in the sense that it may form, together with a noun, a complete 'ibtidā' construction. The two model sentences (21)a,b are treated extensively by the medieval grammarians (e.g. Sībawayhi I, 222ff.; and cf. 207, 17-21, 241, 18f.), and some of the points raised by them are certainly relevant to the problem of 'amal and 'ibtidā' here under discussion. But, like other issues that touch on this subject, the grammarians' treatment of cases as (21) deserves a separate investigation. At this stage I only wish to indicate that, while the grammarians differ on the analysis of *ḡaydun*, some viewing it as a *mubtada'* and others as *fā'il* (postulating an underlying verb like *'istaqarra* — see, e.g. Ibn al-Anbārī I, 51-5), they invariably present *qā'iman* in (21)b as *ḡāl*, and *qā'imun* in (21)a as *ḡabar*. In the latter case, *fīḡā* is normally described as an element that undergoes 'ilḡā' (see, e.g. Sībawayhi I, 223, 2).

As will be recalled, in section 3 'ilḡā' was presented as a process of neutralization of government in cases where *ḡanantu* etc. enter into a *mubtada'* + *ḡabar* construction in sentence-non-initial position (and *ta'liq* in section 4 was likewise associated with this same 'ibtidā' construction). Now, words like 'ayna, *fīḡā* or *lākin* do not have the potential to govern in the first place. So the use (in later periods) of the term 'ilḡā' in connection with sentences such as (20)a and (21)a (and cf. Ibn Jinnī's "*mulḡayāt*" in *Luma'*, 93, referring to a wide range of words) manifests a considerably extended version of the concept

of *'ilgā'*, apparently based on Sībawayhi's use of the term *'ilgā'* in similar cases. When the grammarian says that *'ayna* or *fihā* is *mulgāh*, what he means is that it does not act as an *'Ā*, and that the clause following it, either nominal or verbal, is an *'ibtidā'* clause, in the sense that it has the potential to form an independent sentence (*'ibtidā'*<sup>2</sup>).

Indeed, one can draw a line connecting adverbials as *fihā*, through interrogative adverbials as *'ayna*, with various *hurūf 'ibtidā'* such as *'innamā*, *lākin* and *'id*. Underlying the grammarians' treatment of all these cases are extended concepts of *'ilgā'* and *'ibtidā'* (*'ibtidā'*<sup>2</sup>), and it is these extended concepts that enable them to accommodate the above cases within their *'Ā*-theory.

## 6. Conclusion

The issues discussed in this paper illustrate some serious theoretical problems that the medieval Arab grammarians faced in their attempt to reconcile the two concepts of *'amal* and *'ibtidā'*.

As we have seen, the essence of *'ibtidā'* in Sībawayhi's view, is the introduction of a sentence by a nominal so as to construe it with another element for the purpose of predication (*'isnād* — cf. Levin, *Kāna* 197, n. 1). While it is true that Sībawayhi conceived of *'ibtidā'* as some kind of *'Ā*, it was only at a later period that the dichotomy *'Ā ma'nawī* vs. *'Ā lafẓī* was introduced into the *'Ā*-theory. The definition of *'Ā ma'nawī* as (at least in part) the absence of an *'Ā lafẓī* was designed to give substance to *'ibtidā'* as an external *'Ā* accountable for the *raf'* case of the subject in a nominal sentence.

However, this extension of the *'Ā*-theory, which enabled it to accommodate the cardinal *'ibtidā'* construction 'x is y', created other problems, notably in cases combining both a morphologically realized *'Ā* and *'ibtidā'*. Constructions such as *ẓanantu ẓaydan qā'iman* were dealt with by presenting *kāna*, *ẓanna* and *'inna* as replacing (*nawāsix*) the *'Ā 'ibtidā'*. However, more serious problems were presented by cases such as *ẓaydun ẓanantu muntaliqun* and *ẓanantu la-ẓaydun muntaliqun*. For these, the respective sub-theories of *'ilgā'* and *ta'līq* had to be formulated and introduced as new components into the extended *'Ā*-theory. Indeed, apart from Ibn al-Sarrāj's account, where *'ilgā'* is presented as equivalent to *ẓiyādah*, *'ilgā'* and *ta'līq* in medieval Arabic grammatical theory are generally associated with *mubtada'* + *xabar* constructions. They are designed to account for cases displaying

both 'ibtidā' and a morphologically realized potential 'Ā without that 'Ā actually exercising government. In these cases, then, the government of the verb/particle is described as neutralized ('ilgā') or suspended (*ta'liq*); *ḡayḡun* is thus presented as *mubtada'* in an 'ibtidā' construction ('ibtidā'ī), whose *raf'* ending is accounted for by the abstract (*ma'nawī*) 'Ā, 'ibtidā'.

But the most serious threat to the 'Ā-theory was presented by such cases as *lākin|'ayna|fihā ḡayḡun qā'imun*. In these cases one cannot invoke 'ilgā'/ta'liq, i.e. neutralization/suspension of government in the usual sense, because, unlike *ḡanantu*, *lākin* etc. do not have the potential to govern in the first place. Further, *ḡayḡun qā'imun* in the above example is substitutable by *yaqūmu ḡayḡun*, a verbal construction. In order to account for the *raf'* endings of *ḡayḡun* and *qā'imun*, the grammarians had recourse to considerably extended concepts of 'ilgā' and 'ibtidā', already existing in Sībawayhi's time. They presented *lākin*, 'ayna and *fihā* as *mulḡayāt*, in the sense that they do not act as operators ('awāmil); *ḡayḡun qā'imun* and *yaqūmu ḡayḡun* (following a particle) were equally described as 'ibtidā' constructions, in the sense that they have the potential of forming an independent sentence. Thus, in *lākin ḡayḡun qā'imun*, *ḡayḡun* could be analysed as *mubtada'*, whereas in *lākin yaqūmu ḡayḡun*, *ḡayḡun* could be described as *fā'il* of *yaqūmu*, the latter being accountable, as 'Ā, for its *raf'* case.

Indeed, the vast majority of the medieval Arab grammarians took great pains to construct their 'Ā-theory, the core of their grammatical argumentation, in a way that would enable it to account for any inflectional marker in any construction. In the present article we dealt with a number of issues concerning the grammarians' attempt to make their 'Ā-theory embrace various 'ibtidā' configurations. Further investigation might reveal further concepts and modifications introduced into the 'Ā-theory so as to solve various other theoretical questions arising from this problematic combination of 'amal and 'ibtidā'.

## REFERENCES

- Abū Ḥayyān — *Abū Ḥayyān's commentary on the Alfiyya of Ibn Mālik: Kitāb manhaj al-sālik*. Ed. S. Glazer. New Haven 1947.  
 Baṭalyūsī — Abū Muḥammad 'Abdallāh...al-Baṭalyūsī: *Kitāb al-ḡulal fī 'iṣlāḡ al-xalal min kitāb al-Jumal*. Ed. S. 'A. Sa'ūdī. Baghdad 1980.  
 Carter — M.G. Carter (ed.): *Arab Linguistics: An introductory classical text with translation and notes (Širbīnī's Nūr al-sajjyah)*. Amsterdam 1981.

- Fleischer — H.L. Fleischer: *Kleinere Schriften*. 3 vols. Leipzig 1885-1888.
- Goldenberg — G. Goldenberg: 'Subject and Predicate in Arab Grammatical Tradition.' In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 138/1 (1988), 39-73.
- Ḥaydarah — 'Alī Ibn Sulaymān al-Ḥaydarah: *Kaṣf al-muṣkil fī l-naḥw*. Ed. H. 'A. Maṭar. 2 vols. Baghdad 1984.
- Ibn Abī l-Rabī' — 'Ubaydallāh b. Aḥmad... Ibn Abī l-Rabī': *al-Basīt fī ṣarḥ Jumal al-Zajjājī*. Ed. 'A. b. Ṭ. al-Ṭabīṭī. 2 vols. Beirut 1986.
- Ibn al-Anbārī — Abū l-Barakāt 'Abd al-Raḥmān... Ibn al-Anbārī: *Kitāb al-Inṣāf fī masā'il al-xilāf bayn al-naḥwiyyīn al-baṣriyyīn wa-l-kūfiyyīn*. Ed. M.M. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. 2 vols. Cairo 1961.
- Ibn 'Aqīl — 'Abdallāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān... Ibn 'Aqīl: *Ṣarḥ Ibn 'Aqīl 'alā Alfīyyat Ibn Mālik*. Ed. M.M. 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. 2 vols. Beirut 1972.
- Ibn Hišām — Jamāl al-Dīn Ibn Hišām al-Anṣārī: *Muḡnī l-labīb 'an kutub al-'a'arīb*. Eds. M. al-Mubārak and M. 'A. Ḥamdallāh. 2 parts. Beirut 1969.
- Ibn Jinnī, *Luma'* — Abū l-Faṭḥ 'Uṭmān Ibn Jinnī: *Kitāb al-luma' fī l-naḥw*. Ed. H.M. Kechrida. Uppsala 1976.
- Ibn Jinnī, *Xaṣā'is* — Abū l-Faṭḥ 'Uṭmān Ibn Jinnī: *al-Xaṣā'is*. Ed. M. 'A. al-Najjār. 3 vols. Beirut n.d.
- Ibn Maḍā' — Abū l-'Abbās... Ibn Maḍā' al-Qurṭubī: *Kitāb al-radd 'alā l-nuḥāb*. Ed. Š. Dayf. Cairo 1947.
- Ibn al-Sarrāj — Abū Bakr Muḥammad Ibn al-Sarrāj: *al-'Uṣūl fī l-naḥw*. Ed. 'A. al-Fatālī. 3 vols. Beirut 1988.
- Ibn Šuqayr — Abū Bakr Aḥmad... b. Šuqayr al-Baḡdādī: *al-Muḥallā Wujūb al-naṣb*. Ed. F. Fāris. Beirut 1987.
- Ibn 'Uṣfūr — 'Alī b. Mu'min... Ibn 'Uṣfūr: *Ṣarḥ Jumal al-Zajjājī*. Ed. Š. Abū Janāḥ. 2 vols. Mosul 1980-1982.
- Ibn Ya'īs — Muwaffaq al-Dīn... Ibn Ya'īs: *Ṣarḥ al-Mufaṣṣal*. 10 parts. Cairo n.d.
- Jurjānī — 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Jurjānī: *Kitāb al-muqtaṣid fī ṣarḥ al-'Idāḥ*. Ed. K. B. al-Marjān. 2 vols. Baghdad 1982.
- Levin, *Distinction* — A. Levin: 'The distinction between nominal and verbal sentences according to the Arab grammarians.' In: *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 15 (1985), 118-127.
- Levin, *Kāna* — A. Levin: 'Sībawayhi's view of the syntactical structure of *kāna wa-'axawātuhā*.' In *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1 (1979), 185-213.
- Levin, *Musnad* — A. Levin: 'The Grammatical Terms *al-musnad*, *al-musnad 'ilayhi* and *al-'isnād*. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 101 (1981), 145-165.
- Mubarrad — Abū l-'Abbās Muḥammad... al-Mubarrad: *Kitāb al-muqtaḍab*. Ed. M. 'A. 'Uḍaymah. 4 vols. Cairo 1385-1388 A.H.
- Nebes (1982) — N. Nebes: 'In *al-muḥaffafa* und *al-lām al-fāriqa*. I.' In: *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 7 (1982), 7-22.
- Nebes (1985) — N. Nebes: 'In *al-muḥaffafa* und *al-lām al-fāriqa*. II.' In: *Zeitschrift für arabische Linguistik* 14 (1985), 7-44.

- Owens — J. Owens: *The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory*. Amsterdam 1988.
- Reckendorf — H. Reckendorf: *Arabische Syntax*. Heidelberg 1921.
- Šantamarī — Ibn al-Hajjāj Yūsuf...al-ma‘rūf bi-l-‘A‘lam al-Šantamarī: *al-Nukat fī tafsīr Kitāb Sībawayhi*. Ed. Z.‘A. Sultān. vol. I. Kuwait 1987.
- Sībawayhi — Abū Bišr ‘Amr b. ‘Utmān Sībawayhi: *al-Kitāb*. Ed. H. Derenbourg. 2 vols. Paris 1881-1889.
- Suyūṭī — Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī: *al-Ašbāh wa-l-naẓā‘ir fī l-naḥw*. Ed. ‘A.S. Mukarram. 9 vols. Beirut 1985.
- Wright — W. Wright: *A Grammar of the Arabic Language*. 2 vols. Cambridge 1896-1898.
- Xalaf al-Aḥmar — Xalaf b. Ḥayyān al-Aḥmar: *Muqaddimah fī l-naḥw*. Ed. ‘I. al-Tanūxī. Damascus 1961.
- al-Xalīl b. Aḥmad — al-Xalīl b. Aḥmad al-Farāhīdī: *Kitāb al-jumal fī l-naḥw*. Ed. F. Qabāwah. Beirut 1985.
- Zajjājī, *Jumal* — Abū l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Raḥmān...al-Zajjājī: *al-Jumal*. Ed. M. Ben Cheneb. Paris 1957.
- Zajjājī, *Majālis* — Abū l-Qāsim ‘Abd al-Raḥmān...al-Zajjājī: *Majālis al-‘ulamā’*. Ed. ‘A.M. Hārūn. Kuwait 1962.

# AN ENIGMATIC EXPRESSION IN UGARITIC

BY

WILFRED G. E. WATSON

The meaning of the word *nz*l in Ugaritic is difficult to determine because it only occurs twice, in parallel passages which also present problems<sup>1</sup>. The general context describes Kirta (or Keret), after ceremonial ablutions, performing a ritual in which he is grasping a sacrificial lamb and later, pouring wine and honey into separate bowls (KTU 1.14 ii 9-19 // 1.14 iii 52 — iv 2)<sup>2</sup>. Between these two actions he is portrayed performing as follows: *klt. lhmb. dnz*l *lqh. msrr. 'sr. db[h]*<sup>3</sup>. Before attempting to translate these words it is necessary to look at the expression *lh*m *dnz*l<sup>4</sup>, the meaning of which depends, of course, on how *nz*l is to be understood. Sample renderings of the whole expression are<sup>5</sup>: (1) "offering-bread, shew-bread"<sup>6</sup>; (2) "bread of blessing"<sup>7</sup>; (3) "the choicest of (your/his)

<sup>1</sup> It may occur in KTU 4.243: 24 (according to Gordon, UT # 19.1629, as a place-name) but the reading in KTU is *nbl*. The reading is accepted by M. Liverani, "Economia delle fattorie palatine ugaritiche", *Dialoghi di archeologia* 1 (1979) 57-72, 59 and n. 8.

<sup>2</sup> The second passage is the fulfilment of the god Ilu's command in the first, with virtually identical wording. A resumé of the whole passage is provided by M. C. A. Korpel, *A Rift in the Clouds* (Münster, 1990) 416-417.

<sup>3</sup> KTU 1.14 iii 58-59. The parallel passage is KTU 1.14 ii 16-18: *klt. l[h*m.] *dnz*l *qh. ms[rr.] 'sr dbh*.

<sup>4</sup> In the forms *l[hmk]* *dnz*l || *lhmb dnz*l. The parallel indicates that the suffix *-k* is to be restored in the first passage.

<sup>5</sup> For surveys cf. TOug I, 513, note p.; del Olmo Lete, MLC, 589; A. H. Mustafa, *Acta Orientalia* [Hungary] 29 (1975) 101; F. C. Fensham, *JNSL* 4 (1975) 17.

<sup>6</sup> De Moor — Spronk, *UF* 14 (1982) 161: "On the strength of the Arabic parallels *nz*l should be compared with Arab. *nuzul* "improvised meal (for a guest)", but also "present". So *lh*m *dnz*l is "offering-bread, shew-bread". Similarly, del Olmo Lete, MLC, 297.589: "pan de ofrenda". The credit for this suggestion goes to A. C. H. Mustafa, *Acta Orientalia* [Hungary] 29 (1975) 101.

<sup>7</sup> L. Badre et al., "Notes ougaritiques I. Keret", *Syria* 53 (1976) 95-126: "Cette expression signifie en arabe litt. < < nourriture bénédiction > >" (p. 106; see there for details).



bread”<sup>8</sup>; (4) “bread made with oil”<sup>9</sup>; (5) “meat of seclusion”<sup>10</sup>; (6) “all that was left of (thy/his) bread-corn”<sup>11</sup>; (7) “all (your/his) food in plenty”<sup>12</sup>. Of these, all but (4) refer to Arabic for cognates.

A pointer in a slightly different direction is supplied by Greenfield when discussing a difficult passage in Syriac Aḥiqar (no. 10), with a parallel in Tobit (4:17). He shows that both texts use equivalents of the construction “to pour (out) bread” = “to provide food”, known from Aramaic<sup>13</sup>. The expression occurs twice in the third inscription from Sefire (KAI 224:) line 5 *lts[ k l]hm lhm*, “and do not provide them with food” and in line 7: *wtsk lhm lhm*, “and if<sup>14</sup> you provide them with food”<sup>15</sup>. The corresponding expression, then, may be present in Ugaritic *lhm* + *nʕl*, if like Akk. *naṣālu*<sup>16</sup>, Ug. *nʕl* also means “to pour” (the verb occurs only here).

Unfortunately, although “to provide food” now seems a plausible alternative to the range of previous suggestions, translation of the whole couplet remains uncertain. This is because both *klt* and *msrr* are not unambiguous and there are even problems with stichometry<sup>17</sup>. The translation offered here, then, can only be tentative.

<sup>8</sup> Gibson, CML<sup>2</sup>, 84.86; (“properly bread offered to guests”, *ibid.*, 84, n. 2); TOug I, 513 (and n.p.).527. So already J. Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache* (Berlin 1963) 204-205, # 1765.

<sup>9</sup> G. Pettinato (apud M. J. Dahood) in L. Cagni, ed., *La Lingua di Ebla* (Naples 1981) 180, cited by E. Zurro, *Bib* 64 (1983) 578 who in turn refers to Heb. *lehem šemen* (Ex. 29, 23; Lev 8, 26). For Ebla *nizlu*, “oil of the first pressing” cf. G. Conti *Miscellanea Eblaïtica*, 3 (Quaderni di Semitistica 17; Florence, 1990), 75-76.108.167;

<sup>10</sup> J. Gray, *The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra* (Leiden, 1964) 37 — considered “douteux” in TOug I 513, note p.

<sup>11</sup> Driver, CML, 29.33 and 157a.

<sup>12</sup> Mustafa, *Acta Orientalia* [Hungary] 29 (1975) 101: “Der Ausdruck *lhm k d-nʕl* hat erstaunlicherweise eine exakte Parallele in Arabischen, und zwar *fa’āmun dū (n-) naʕali* < < reichliches Essen, Essen im Überfluß > >“.

<sup>13</sup> J. C. Greenfield, “Two Proverbs of Aḥiqar” in T. Abusch, J. Huehnergard, and P. Steinkeller, edd: *Lingering over Words* [= Moran Festschrift](HSS 37, Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1990) 195-201, esp. 199-201. He tentatively reconstructs the original of Tobit 4:17 as \*(bry) *sk lhm k l qbr y dyqy w l ttn lr šy y*, “(my son) provide food for the graves of the righteous but give none to the wicked”.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. *whn* in line 6.

<sup>15</sup> See the comments by J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Aramaic Inscriptions of Sefire* (Rome, 1967) 108-109. As Fitzmyer notes, the expression recurs (in elliptical form) in Sef. B I(KAI 222 B) 38.

<sup>16</sup> For Akkadian cf. CAD N/2, 134b-135c: “to pour out [molten glass], drain”; however, W. von Soden, *AHW*, 771b, only “entleeren”.

<sup>17</sup> Gibson, CML<sup>2</sup>, 84 divides: *klt lhm k dnʕl | qb msrr šr dbh*.

*klt lhmb dnzl lqb*  
*msrr 'sr dbb*

Measures<sup>18</sup> of the food provided him he took,  
 a fowl<sup>19</sup>, a bird of oblation<sup>20</sup>.

In the syntagma *lhmb/k dnzl*, lit., "his/your food which was poured", the construction used is: relative pronoun (*d*) + internal passive (*nzl*). Comparable are *yn hsp d nkly*, "bottled(?)<sup>21</sup> wine which has been consumed" (KTU 4.213: 24)<sup>22</sup> and *argmn ... d ybl lšpš mlk rb b'lh*, "tribute... which was brought to the 'Sun', the Great King, his Lord" (KTU 3.1: 25-26). Another possibility is that *nzl* is an impersonal G 3m. plural<sup>23</sup>.

If correctly identified, the expression is somewhat banal; it is hard to see why a simple term for food was not used. Perhaps there are funerary overtones<sup>24</sup> or perhaps a ceremonial sample of the rations to be prepared for the troops (KTU 1.14 ii 27-31 // 1.14 iv 8-12) was involved in the rooftop ritual. At present we can only surmise.

<sup>18</sup> Or "bowls"; *klt* may be a plural of unattested \**kēl*; cf. Akk. *kallu* (pl. *kallātu*) "bowl (made of clay or wood)" used in ritual for flour, roasted grain, etc. (CAD K, 83). Another possibility is "all of" (e.g. Gray, *Krt*, 12) but del Olmo Lete, *AuOr* 1 (1983) 171 explicitly rejects this.

<sup>19</sup> As most scholars accept, with reference to Ethiopic; cf. De Moor — Spronk, *UF* 14 (1982) 161 and n. 67; Gibson, *CML*<sup>2</sup>, 85 (although the word is left untranslated on pp. 84 and 86). The alternative is "entrails" for which cf. Driver, *CML*, 160; Gordon, *UT* # 19.1798; del Olmo Lete, *MLC*, 581. Gray, *Krt Text*, 37, mentions but rejects both "entrails" and the possibility that *msrr 'sr* could mean "a bundle of incense" (citing Arabic). It is unlikely that *msrr* means "knife" (Aistleitner, *Wörterbuch* [note 8] 224, # 1954) but "entrails" is very plausible in view of their significance in Ugaritic ritual; cf. G. del Olmo Lete, "Anatomía cultural en Ugarit. Ofrenda de vísceras en el culto ugarítico", *AuOr* 7 (1989) 123-125, although *msrr* does not occur in the ritual texts.

<sup>20</sup> With the corresponding translation for the "command" passage.

<sup>21</sup> The meaning of *hsp* is uncertain; cf. P. Xella, *I testi rituali di Ugarit*, I (Rome, 1981) 343-344; M. Heltzer, *UF* 22 (1990) 130, leaves the term untranslated. See, in general, Dietrich-Loretz, *UF* 13 (1981) 196 and n. 16.

<sup>22</sup> Cited by S. Segert, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* (Berkeley, 1984) 98 (# 64.73).

<sup>23</sup> An example in Ug. is *gmh d kly bbt skn lilldrn*. "Flour they distributed in the house of the governor for PN" (KTU 4.361:1; similarly, 4.362:1) for which cf. Verreet, *OLP* 17 (1986) 78 and the references, *ibid.*, n. 33. The possibility of the impersonal 3rd m. plur. was suggested to me by Professor T. Moraoka in a letter. In addition to his comments on an earlier draft he was kind enough to provide help with references.

<sup>24</sup> See the comments by Greenfield [note 13] on this aspect.

Note the abbreviations:

AHw — W. von Soden. *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch* I-III (Wiesbaden, 1959-1981)

CAD — *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago* (Chicago, 1956ff.)

CML<sup>2</sup> — J. C. L. Gibson, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (Edinburgh, 1978).

MLC — G. del Olmo Lete, *Mitos y Leyendas de Canaán según la tradición de Ugarit* (Madrid, 1981)

TOug I — A. Caquot — M. Szyncer — A. Herdner, *Textes Ougaritiques Tome I. Mythes et légendes* (Paris, 1974).

## REVIEWS

A. Murtonen, *Reality and the Bible. Prolegomena to a Multidimensional Interpretation of the Bible*. Melbourne, 1991. Pp. viii + 223. Private publication available from the author at Tallarook, Victoria 3659, Australia for A\$ 12 plus postage.

This a very personal, idiosyncratic book — “somewhat in the nature of memoirs,” he calls it — by a scholar known more for his work in the field of Semitic linguistics than as an exegete. He is a Lutheran pastor, however, as well as an academic, renowned in the University of Melbourne, not only for his radical politics, likeable eccentricities and the vast range of his knowledge and interests, but also as a generous-spirited, sympathetic and deeply religious person. *Reality and the Bible* is thus a gentle, rather rambling monograph, full of interesting digressions, passing comments and personal reminiscences, quite often “only remotely relevant” (to use one of his own phrases) to the argument. This is what is meant by “a multidimensional interpretation of the Bible.”

Chapter 1 “The Cosmic Horizon” introduces the “dreamtime” traditions of the Australian aborigines, particle physics and quantum mechanics to help us understand Genesis.

Chapter 2, the longest chapter, is devoted to the “Psychic Dimension,” and in this Murtonen draws freely on his own and others’ experiences of ESP, psychokinesis, Uri Geller, UFOs, Tarot cards and the like in order to interpret such passages as the ascension of Elijah and the Johannine miracle stories. Here as frequently elsewhere Jungian psychology figures prominently.

Chapters on “The Messiah” and “The Law” are rather less “multidimensional.” The first contains brief, at times rather oversimplified discussions of the Suffering Servant, the Nativity stories, the Virgin Birth, the Messianic Secret and the like, while the second is mainly an analysis of the Decalogue with some engaging digressions on love, repentance (“turn-around”) and rebirth, again with much Jungian psychology. Short chapters follow on “Sex and Love” (polygyny, AIDS, homosexuality, Freud) and “Death and Beyond” (Near Death Experiences, Out of Body Experiences). The last chapter, “The Great Divide,” introduced by an Isaac Asimov quotation, and beginning with Second Isaiah, focusses on “the second quarter of the last pre-Christian millennium which may therefore be called the great dividing range of not only Israelite religion, but of human mental and/or spiritual and psychic development in a more comprehensive and far-reaching sense,” and concludes that this presupposes “a common co-ordina-

ting factor or entity whether we call it God or Spirit or the God archetype of the collective unconscious."

The juxtaposition of material from so many disciplines cannot fail to raise new questions even about some of the most thoroughly dug-over areas of the field. It is perhaps a pity that the author does not engage more with current biblical research. A discussion of sexuality in the Bible, for example, without even a passing reference to the last ten years of women's writing on the subject, is inevitably flawed. But there are plenty of thought-provoking ideas such as the suggestion that the "young woman" in Isaiah 7:14 was "in such an advanced state of pregnancy that even the characteristic frontal 'bump' held to indicate a male embryo was evident" (p. 87), or that Freud perhaps knew that "the basic meaning" of the Hebrew word for "to dream" is "to be healthy, vigorous, (sexually) mature" (p. 146).

There is a long and fully glossed bibliography, plus indices of biblical references and authors. The volume is well-printed apart from the absence of a final sigma in the Greek type, and the decision to use the author's own rather quaint transcription of Hebrew, for a key to which the reader must consult the first volume of the author's *Hebrew in its North West Semitic Setting* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1986).

John F.A. Sawyer

J. Neusner, *Song of Songs Rabbah. An Analytical Translation*. Volume one. *Song of Songs Rabbah to Song Chapter One Through Three* (Brown Judaic Studies, 197) Pp. xii + 260; Volume Two *Song of Songs Rabbah to Song Chapters Four Through Eight* (Brown Judaic Studies, 198) Pp. xvi + 257; Scholars Press, Atlanta, Georgia, 1989.

There is no doubt that the enormous work of J. Neusner indicates an organized plan and a specific project, since, had it not been so, the minimum time required after conclusion of a work to plan the next one would delay its execution longer than the time taken by Neusner for release of two new books — and this is not a criticism, but the expression of my deepest admiration. However, it is not pointless that the author himself reminds us of that plan and global project, as he in fact does in the preface to this publication, and places this translation within the general framework of the research he has been carrying out during the last thirty years. It belongs to the third stage of his whole project: the first being constituted by the Mishnah and its associated writings, the second is the Yerushalmi and its affiliated documents, particularly Genesis Rabbah and Leviticus Rabbah, and finally, the third constituted by the Bavli and its congeners, which are Lamentations Rabbah, Esther Rabbah I, Ruth Rabbah, and Song of Songs Rabbah. Taking all this into account, there is no doubt that

J. Neusner will enter the history of Judaic studies as the most prolific author of the last quarter of the XXth century, with an activity that may be compared with that carried out, *mutatis mutandis*, by some of the great men of Medieval Judaism; and if his opinions can be here and there questionable, the highly suggestive character of his work is unquestionable.

Neusner puts together in this work two aspects: analytic study and translation, which are quite different approaches; neither of the two needs the other, and each one can be justified by itself, although both are forms of interpretation of the original texts.

He recognizes the high quality of the existing translation into English, that of Maurice Simon in Volume IX of the Soncino Collection "Midrash Rabbah"; and it is true that the need of a new version, to which Neusner does not refer this time as 'American translation,' would barely be justified were it not for the analytic study to which he submits the text, and for the application of a detailed system of internal reference that, at the same time as it provides a schematic view of each paragraph, it can solve once and for all the difficulties which are always present when quoting with accuracy these works, albeit for this last purpose the system of Neusner's may be excessively detailed, and of course it is not the only one possible.

I agree with Neusner in that the mere translation of the text is not enough, or, maybe to formulate it better, the mere translation of the text is but a partial aim that must be extended by further studies, but it is also true that the analytic study does not need in the least a translation, since those who may be interested in said study in order to reach deepest conclusions do not need at all the translation into English nor into any other language, and would have enough if the reference system were to be applied directly on the Hebrew text.

The partial aims are, in my opinion, fully justified, and are even absolutely necessary, for the advance of science and research has its historic 'tempo,' which only a few geniuses can skip, while most of the human beings, even marvellous, conscious and serious researchers, must live with that pace.

Translation can also have other purposes and characteristics: doubtless, first of all the informing aspect among speakers of a language other than the original one, members of another culture; and if it is interesting to provide the reader with the analytic 'interpretation' of a text, it is not less worthy to provide him with the bare text, so that everybody can attempt his own possible interpretation.

Every researcher is free to choose his field of work and the audience he addresses, and to give that audience whatever it asks for, or whatever he believes the audience needs, and in the German or in the Spanish cultures of today, for example, in which the Jewish element has little weight, but where there exists great interest in Jewish culture, thought and literature from Christian positions (mainly religious-theological), the mere informing

aspect of the contents is fully justified, without having to label this activity, as Neusner does, as 'retrograde,' and its authors as 'supposedly "scientific" translators.' Neusner's work is magnificent, aimed at its readers, among which I assiduously count myself, but precisely because of that he should not discredit, with so categorical an expression, the work of others, aimed often at very different readers. His translation of Song of Songs Rabbah is really clarifying, sometimes more so than the one by Simon, but the latter has, in my opinion, a more elegant style. Those who, as is the case with me, study the text critically, sometimes sense the need of a textual correction of the standard editions, based on the manuscript sources, which would endow this or that passage with a fuller sense, even in Song of Songs Rabbah; Neusner usually acknowledges them when Simon accepts them in his translation, but not when Simon ignores them or relegates them to the notes. But just for the same reason that we defend, against Neusner, the value of the 'mere translations,' we are not going to claim at this point the need to produce always and only critical versions; and so, the affirmation made by Neusner when he says 'let the text-scholar give us their superior versions ... and we shall happily (re)translate the documents quite faithfully' must be accepted. Welcome are as ever the indices to both volumes, and we wait for the Introduction to the 'later midrashic compilations,' which Neusner announces.

L.F. Girón-Blanc

J. Neusner, *Lamentations Rabbah, An Analytical Translation* [Brown Judaic Studies, 193] (Scholars Press: Atlanta, Georgia, 1989). Pp. xvi + 370. ISBN 1-55540.

In the Introduction to this translation of the Midrash Rabbah on Lamentations Neusner clearly states, that it is not a new rendering of the Hebrew text in English, but an adaptation of the translation of A. Cohen in the Soncino *Midrash Rabbah* (eds. H. Freedman and M. Simon). There are no major differences between Neusner's translation and that of Cohen (but on almost every page small changes can be found); even when the Hebrew text of the traditional editions (e.g. in the Midrash Rabbah, ed. Vilna) and Buber's edition, based on some of the manuscripts, are essentially different, Neusner is led by the choice Cohen has made. In those cases a new translation would have benefited from a parallel rendering of both versions. Moreover, since in the near future there will appear a new critical edition of Echa Rabbah, which certainly will be an improvement on the text of the existing editions, it might have been wiser to wait for the publication of that edition. Or are we expected to replace our copy of this provisional translation as soon as Neusner will have produced a new one based on that future edition?

Neusner's main reason for bringing forth his own adaptation of Cohen's translation is his analytical representation of the English text: "I offer the text not as a sequence of undifferentiated columns of words. Rather I represent the Hebrew as a set of distinct and discrete compositions, put together in one way, rather than in some other," and he claims that "on the basis of Cohen's genuinely admirable translation no analytical studies of this document are possible." I do not know which kind of scholars Neusner had in mind, when he wrote this statement; surely everyone who is familiar with rabbinic literature will be able to analyse a composition straightway from the Hebrew text, however it is represented, without being dependent on Cohen's or any other's translations. But even scholars from other fields of interest, or laymen, who are not able to understand the Hebrew text without the help of a translation or who do not know any Hebrew at all, will not understand a midrashic text any more when reading Neusner's analytical text, if they are not versed already in this kind of literature, and if they are, they can understand a traditionally edited text as well. My most serious objection, however, is that too often the way in which Neusner analyses the text will distract a reader from the true comprehension of the text and its structure. This point I need to demonstrate by a few examples of his translation, which at the same time will provide apt opportunities to discuss some minor concerns.

The first *petihta* right away can serve as an example to illustrate my objections; I quote it here in the same form as it is printed in Neusner's analytical translation:

*"Alas! Lonely sits the city once great with people!"*

I.i.

1. A. R. Abba bar Kahana opened [by citing the following verse of Scripture], "'Cry with a shrill voice, O daughter of Gallim [hearken, Laishah! Take up the cry, Anathoth!]' (Isa. 10:30).
- B. "Said Isaiah [printed text: Jeremiah] to Israel, 'Instead of saying songs and psalms before an idol, "Cry with a shrill voice, O daughter of Gallim" (Isa. 10:30).
- C. "'Cry with a shrill voice' in synagogues."
2. A. ["Cry with a shrill voice, O daughter of Gallim" (Isa. 10:30):]
- B. "Daughter of Gallim" [the Hebrew word '*gallim*' may be rendered 'waves']:
- C. Just as waves are readily discerned in the sea, so your forebears [are readily discerned in the world].
3. A. ["Cry with a shrill voice, O daughter of Gallim" (Isa. 10:30):]
- B. Another teaching concerning "[Daughter of] Gallim:"
- C. Daughter of those who go into exile [reading instead of Gallim *Golim*, the exiles].



- D. [Aramaic:] daughter of exiles, daughter of Abraham, concerning whom it is written, "And there was a famine in the land; and Abram went down into Egypt" (Gen. 12:10).
- E. Daughter of Isaac: "And Isaac went to Abimelech, king of the Philistines, to Gerar" (Gen. 26:1).
- F. Daughter of Jacob: "And he went to Paddan-aram" (Gen. 28:5).
- 4. A. "... hearken, [Laishah]:"
- B. "Hearken to the religious duties."
- C. "Hearken to teachings of the Torah."
- D. "Hearken to teachings of prophecy."
- E. "Hearken to the requirements of righteousness and good deeds."
- 5. A. "[... hearken, Laishah:]"
- B. And if not, there will be a *laishah*, that is, a lion will attack you.
- C. This refers to Nebuchadnezzar, the wicked man, concerning whom it is written, "A lion is gone up from his thicket" (Jer. 4:7).
- 6. A. "... Take up the cry, [Anathoth!]" (Isa. 10:30):
- B. [Reading the word for take up the cry with the same consonants but different vowels, the meaning becomes "impoverished," thus:] impoverished in righteous person,
- C. impoverished in teachings of the Torah,
- D. impoverished in teachings of prophecy,
- E. impoverished in religious duties and good deeds.
- 7. A. "[Take up the cry,] Anathoth!" (Isa. 10:30):
- B. And if not, Anathoth, that is, the man of Anathoth will come and prophecy against you words of rebuke,
- C. as it is written, "The words of Jeremiah, son of Hiliiah of the priests who were in Anathoth (Jer. 1:1).
- D. Since retribution has come, [Jeremiah] laments for them: "Alas! Lonely sits the city once great with people!" (Lam. 1:1).

(All inconsistencies in quotation marks, indication of Bible quotations, the use of square brackets, and the printing error "person(s)" in 6.B. are part of Neusner's text.)

In both the traditional editions and ed. Buber the *petiḥta* starts straightway with the opening formula "R. Abba bar Kahana opened" and the opening verse, Isa. 10:30. The quotation of Lam. 1:1 has been put at the head of this and all other *petiḥtaot* by Neusner himself, contrary to the rules for the structure of the *petiḥtaot*, as they are convincingly described by J. Heinemann, "The Proem in the Aggadic Midrashim: A Form-Critical Study", in *Studies in Aggadah and Folk-Literature* (Scripta Hierosolymitana XXII, Jerusalem, 1971), pp. 100-122, and Id., *Derashot beTsibbur biTegufat haTalmud* (Jerusalem, 1970), pp. 7-28. The quotation of the first verse of the text, for which the *petiḥta* is intended, often occurs at the head of that *petiḥta* in our editions — but less often in the best manuscripts —, but there

it serves as an editorial device, to mark clearly the beginning of a new section, according to Heinemann's view. When it is absent in the Hebrew text, why should one add it in a translation? An element of surprise is essential in the character of the *petiḥta* — starting with an opening verse that at first sight has nothing to do with the text for which the *petiḥta* is intended, it develops a strain of thoughts that eventually and often surprisingly leads to the quotation of the beginning of that text. Quoting that text before the opening verse of the *petiḥta* is like playing the theme of the Finale of Beethoven's *Eroica* before starting to play the first bars of that Finale: the notes of those bars turn out surprisingly to be only the accompaniment for the main theme. Why should one spoil this effect, even for those who know that music by heart?!

The translation of the opening verse, Isa. 10:30, apparently is based on modern scientific insights (influenced by the LXX?), by rendering "*aniah*" with "take up the cry", that is at variance with the traditional translations: "o (thou) poor" (see also the Targum), in line with the midrashic comment. The modern translation necessitates the explication in 6.A.-B., suggesting that the author of the *petiḥta* is forcing the text to bear another meaning than the generally accepted one. Such a process does often occur in midrash (we see it e.g. in 2.B.-C. and 3.C.), and even more far-fetched and daring; but here that is not the case: the author of this midrash does not offer a surprisingly new explanation of the word. In this and similar cases it would be advisable to use the traditional (Jewish) translations of the Bible instead of modern ones, in order to represent those verses in the light in which they were read in the midrashic literature. (As to the explication given in 6.B., to my humble opinion both interpretations are based on the same and not different vowels.)

But whereas these two points were related to details by which the general understanding of the text will not be obscured, an erroneous and misleading division of the text is much more serious. Here I have to offer my own proposal for the analysis of this *petiḥta*, as against that of Neusner:

- 1.A. consists of the opening formula and the opening verse, from which the entire *petiḥta* has been developed; it should be marked as a separate entity.

- The main body of this *petiḥta* has a very simple and common structure: each part of the opening verse is commented upon successively: (a) Cry with a shrill voice — (b) O daughter of Gallim — (c) hearken — (d) Laishah — (e) O poor — (f) Anathoth.

Therefore 1.B.-C. should have been taken as a separate entity, being the explanation of the first part (a) of the opening verse.

- The next entity consists of 2.B.-3.F. (for 2.A. see below), commenting on the second part (b) of the opening verse. A subdivision of this entity should have been marked in a different way, and not as two separate entities on a par with the other ones.

- 7.A.-C. represent the explanation of the last word of the opening verse (f), and therefore these lines are an entity on its own, not to be connected with 7.D., which is the transition-line to Lam. 1:1, and not a part of the comment on "Anathoth". The conclusion of the entire *petihta* (7.D.) should have been considered as a separate entity, as it is not only connected with the preceding entity but also with the previous ones.

- From this analysis of the text it becomes clear that Neusner's additions 2.A. and 3.A. and the bracketed words in 4.A., 5.A. (see below), 6.A. and 7.A. are superfluous and even confusing.

A more instructive "analytical representation" of this *petihta* would have been:

I. The opening formula with the opening verse (1.A.)

II. The body of the *petihta*: comments on

- a. Cry with a shrill voice (1.B.-C.)
- b. O daughter of Gallim: 1. (gallim) (2.B.-C.)  
2. (golim) (3.B.-F.)
- c. Hearken (4.A.-E.)
- d. Laishah (5.A.-C.)
- e. O poor (6.A.-E.)
- f. Anathoth (7.A.-C.)

III. The conclusion: transition-line with Lam. 1:1 (7.D.).

In the longer *petihtat* there could be identified even more serious misrepresentations of the true structure, but it would take too much space to demonstrate one of those here; this and the next example will suffice to illustrate my point.

Some minor remarks may serve as examples of the many inaccuracies found in this translation of Lamentations Rabbah:

1.B.: Isaiah [printed text: Jeremiah] — 'Jeremiah' in ed. Buber only.

1.B.: O daughter of Gallim: these words are not found in any of the editions nor in Cohen's translation; as an addition of Neusner, they should have been bracketed. But in fact their addition is not needed, for this section deals only with the first part (a) of the opening verse. The addition has ousted the first explication of "Cry with a shrill voice," that reads: 'with words of Torah,' paralleled by the second one: 'in synagogues' (the only explication left in Neusner's text). The omission is regrettable, as we find these 'words (teachings) of Torah' repeated in 4.C. and 6.C.

3.D.: daughter of exiles: in all editions *barteyhon*, '(their) daughters', but Cohen already translated it as a singular, like suggested in Buber's note.

4.B.: the religious duties: *mitsvot* in ed. Buber, but in the traditional text *mitsvotay*, translated by Cohen with 'My commandments' (see, however, 6.E.).

4.B.-E.: 'Hearken' should have been marked as quotation from the verse in every line, as it should have been done with 'Impoverished' in 6.B.-E.

5.A.: As argued above, only 'Laisha' needs to be quoted here, and so we find it in both versions of the Hebrew text; it should not have been placed between the brackets.

5.B.: Why was it deemed necessary to indicate in 3.D. that the words are in Aramaic, and why not here and in 7.B. too?

6.C.: impoverished in teachings of the Torah: in ed. Buber only, between square brackets, perhaps added from the parallel text in *Pesiqta deRav Kahana* 13.1. Cohen's translation omits these words.

Some of these points are rather trivial, but they do not agree with Neusner's intention in the Introduction: "I wanted my translation to work well for those who have in hand the familiar standard Hebrew printed text and not Buber's. There is a measure of eclecticism, in that occasionally I adopted Buber's formulations of a passage, while in the main presenting the standard Hebrew printed text in faithful accord with Cohen's reading of it." The confusion becomes even greater, when Neusner adds: "... Cohen translated not Buber's text, but Buber's text in accord with Buber's notes, ... ." One has to check constantly both the traditional text and Buber's edition to know which one is represented in Neusner's translation.

The way Neusner's text has been printed does not make it easier to read than the Soncino translation of Cohen. Partly this is due to the fact that Bible quotations are not made conspicuous by means of another type of letter — bold letters or italics, or other typographical devices — to differentiate them from the midrashic text. They are only indicated by quotation marks, without a clear system — both '...' and "..." occur. Quotation marks are used too, when a text is introduced as being said by any authority or other speaking person; if this text itself is a quotation, which contains a Bible verse, this leads to oddities like "...". Moreover, when applying quotation marks, one has to decide what is the end of the saying, and to impose that decision upon the reader. Where, e.g., does the quotation of the words of R. Abba bar Kahana end? Apparently Neusner considered 1.C. to be the last part of his saying; but why should not the entire midrash on Isa. 10:30, up till 7.B. or C., be attributed to R. Abba bar Kahana? But if we do so, are there possibly some later insertions? If the first one of the comments on "Daughter of Gallim" (2.B.-C.) was R. Abba bar Kahana's, the second one may not belong to his original midrash; its insertion may be the work of the author who transformed his saying into a *petiḥta*, or the redactor who entered the *petiḥta* in his collection. I would prefer a text leaving these questions open, to decide for myself when needed.

After each unit of the text, Neusner adds a short commentary to his translation and analysis. Most often his comments are scanty and superficial, stating what everyone can see for himself, and scarcely providing new insights or interesting views about the text, which may help the reader to understand it or to appreciate the achievement of the midrash.

Again the first *petiḥta* may serve as an example. The commentary would have given an opportunity to draw attention to the way the opening verse is interpreted by the comments, by reading a remarkable structure in it: two exhortations, each with a vocative, and after the second exhortation and the second vocative each a warning:

Cry with a shrill voice, O daughter of Gallim,  
 hearken, O thou poor  
 (if not:) Laishah, (if not:) Anathoth

(In the modern translation of Isa. 10:30 we can see only a structure of three exhortations, each with a vocative.)

Then the midrash parallels the comments on "hearken" and "o thou poor," to stress the exhortation and to demonstrate the wanted corrections; but there is some parallellism too between these two sections and the first one (obscured in Neusner's text because of the loss of the first explication of "Cry with a shrill voice"; see above).

In his commentary Neusner first describes that the "exegete" wishes to lead us to the base verse (Lam. 1:1), and to achieve it through an exposition of Isa. 10:30, demonstrating that "by reason of the sins of the Israelites, they have gone into exile ... But this point is made in a somewhat odd way, since we begin, with No. 3, not with a repertoire of sins, but rather with the affirmation that the founders ... also went into exile. Now they cannot be accused of lacking in religious duties ..." Consequently Neusner detects two distinct themes, "the descent from the patriarchs (the matriarchs rarely occur)," and "the fault of the people for their own condition."

Now, the descent from the patriarchs, which is in play already in 2.B.-C., needs to be mentioned as part of the identification of "daughter of Gallim", i.e. Israel. If 'daughter' stands for 'offspring', 'Gallim' must be explained as the 'Fathers'. Two solutions are offered, one taking 'Gallim' in the sense of 'waves' that are conspicuous on a calm and flat surface of the sea, the other explaining it, with a different vowel, as 'exiles'. The 'waves' as an image of the outstanding Fathers does not need any further explication, but 'exiles' as a designation of the Fathers has to be illustrated by prooftexts. Their exile is no main theme, equally important as the true theme of the *petiḥta*; on the contrary, their exile is connected to the main theme in a rather subtle way, by the choice of Gen. 28:5 for Jacob, instead of a prooftext from Gen. 46 ff. From Paddan-aram Jacob returned, as Abraham and Isaac came back from their exile (during which they were helped by God). This is an element of comfort, and a background for the admonitions: even in exile (and after the Destruction of the Temple in Israel too) it is important to keep to the religious duties, like the Fathers did. This *petiḥta* does not mention any reason for their exile, but one cannot say that the tannaim and amoraim did not dare to criticize the Fathers and find the faults that could have led to such a punishment. So, perhaps, we may see in

3.B.. not only comfort, but a kind of warning too, as a counterpart to the warnings read in the second part of the opening verse.

As a second example of Neusner's translation and analysis, *petihta* 14 will serve well, being rather short too, but long enough to show a not too simple structure. Here, however, I shall try to arrange the text in a way that may enable the reader more readily than Neusner's system allows, to grasp the structure of this *petihta*. In the left margin Neusner's marks are retained, to demonstrate his division of this text against mine; but Neusner's quotation marks are for the most part omitted. (For some smaller changes, see the note after this text.)

1. A. R. Hanina b. Papa commenced [by citing the following verse of Scripture]: **If a wise man is judged with a foolish man, whether he be angry or laugh, there will be no rest** (Prov. 29:9).
- B. — Said R. Simon, Whoever enters into judgment with a fool will himself be judged.
- C. That is in line with this verse: ... **a wise man is judged** .... What is written is not 'judges' but '**is judged with.**'
2. A. — Another interpretation of the verse, [**if a wise man is judged with a foolish man, whether he be angry of laugh, there will be no rest**]:
- B. **If a wise man is judged:** this refers to the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is said: *He is wise in heart and mighty in strength* (Job 9:4).
- C. **With a foolish man:** this refers to Israel, as it is said: *For my people are foolish* (Jer. 4:22).
- D. **Whether he be angry or laugh:** [God says,] I was angry and had no rest, I laughed and had no rest <or: there is no rest>.
- E. — I was angry with you in the days of Pekah, son of Remaliah, as it is said: *For Pekah the son of Remaliah slew ...* (2 Chr. 28:6).
- 2.F.=3.A. — I laughed with you in the days of [the victorious] Amaziah, as it is said: *And Amaziah took courage and led his people forth and went to the Valley of Salt* (2 Chr. 25:11).
3. B. What is *the Valley of Salt*?
- C. beneath banks of salt, beneath boulder into battle [following Cohen, p. 20].
- D. *And other ten thousand did the children of Judah carry away alive and brought them into the top of the rock and cast them down* (2 Chr. 25:12):
- E. At that time said the Holy One, blessed be He, I decreed only death by the sword for the children of Noah, but these have *brought them into the top of the rock and cast them down, that they all were broken into pieces.*

4. A.-B. **There will be no rest:** At that time the Holy One blessed be He said, What are these doing here? Let them go into exile.
5. A. When they sinned, they went into exile,  
 B. and when they went into exile, Jeremiah began to lament for them:  
**Alas! Lonely sits the city once great with people!** (Lam. 1:1).

Note: some small changes had to be made in the text of Neusner's translation; these are listed here:

In 2.A. the brackets are mine; the full quotation of the verse is not found in any edition of the Hebrew text, but this — Neusner's — addition may be useful to elucidate the structure.

In 2.B., "as it is said": so the Hebrew texts; Neusner renders it without any presumable reason with "as it is written." The same introduction formula for the prooftexts is used in 2.C., 2.E. and 2.F.(3.A.), where it has been omitted in Neusner's text; I have restored it here.

In 2.E. I left out Neusner's addition "[God continues,]" as it does not serve any purpose.

2.F. is repeated between square brackets in Neusner's text, marked 3.A.; see below.

3.C. reads in Cohen: "[He lead them] beneath banks of salt; [or, according to another explanation: he led them] beneath boulders into battle," with his note: "Text and meaning are uncertain."

3.E. *That they all were broken into pieces:* Cohen's translation of this part of the verse; Neusner translates: "and every one burst open," suggesting by his use of quotation marks that these words were a midrashic comment instead of being part of the verse (2 Chr. 25:12).

For my own additional remark in 2.D., <...>, see below.

The body of this *petiḥta* consists of two parts: (a) a short comment of R. Simon (1.B.-C.) concerning the first verbal form in the opening verse, and (b) a series of comments on the opening verse dealing with all its parts successively (2.A.-4.B.); this may be from R. Ḥanina b. Papa, who is often in discussion with R. Simon. The conclusion (5.A.-B.) — the transition-line and Lam. 1:1 — can easily be separated from the preceding comments, and be considered as a separate entity; the same transition-line is found in fifteen of the thirty odd *petiḥtaot* of Echah Rabbah (nos. 5, 6, 8, 9a, 9b, 12, 13, 14, 22, 26, 30, 31a, 32b, 32, 33). For this phenomenon, see R.S. Sarason, "The Petiḥtot in Leviticus Rabba: 'Oral Homilies' or Redactional Constructions?", *JJS* 33, 1982, pp. 557-567; but I do not agree with his view that these identical transition-lines are the product of the final redactor of the collection, as there are indications that they belong to an earlier stage of the transmission of (collections of) *petiḥtaot*.

The first part of the *petiḥta*, R. Simon's saying, needs not to be subdivided, but if one would do so, we may discern three parts: a statement

(provoked by Prov. 29:9?), a proof-text, and a grammatical remark demonstrating the relevance of this proof-text. In his commentary Neusner suggests that this part in fact has nothing to do with the purpose of the *petiḥta*, but I wonder if it does not prepare in some way for 2.E. ff.

The second part consists of the heading (2.A.) and the comments on the four parts of the opening verse: 2.B., 2.C., 2.D.-3.E., 4.A-B. Only the place of 4.A.-B. in the structure is not easy to determine: is it an entity on the same line as the other three, or is it subordinate to the preceding one?

In 2.B. and C. the wise and the fool are identified (with proof-texts); the verb is not commented upon in contrast with the saying of R. Simon (is that the reason why that saying has been retained in this composition?). The subject of the third entity is less clear: is it only the part of the verse quoted in 2.D., or also the last part, *there will be no rest*, that is commented upon? In the Hebrew text the words rendered in the translation by "and had no rest" are the same as the last words of the verse — one may consider them as a quotation, but to express that view in the translation, the verse should be translated closer to the Hebrew text, e.g., *A wise man my contend with a foolish man, and he may be angry or laugh, but there is no rest* — [God said,] I was angry, *and there is no rest*, I laughed, *and there is no rest*.

The section continues with the demonstration of God being angry (2.E.) and laughing (2.F.) in different situations, with proof-texts. The first case ends with that proof-text, cut short with "etc." in the Hebrew texts (left out by Neusner). The subsection about the second case (2.F. ff.), after an obscure gloss on words of the proof-text (3.B.-C.), continues with the sequel of that proof-text (3.D.), with its comment (3.E.). I suppose that, just as 2 Chr. 25:11 illustrates the case of God laughing, so 2 Chr. 25:12 serves to explain 'and had no rest' or '*there is no rest*' (2.D.). The argument of the midrash is: whether God was angry and caused his people to be defeated, or laughed and granted them a victory, they persisted in doing evil things. They were allowed to kill their enemies in battle (2 Chr. 25:11 ends: *and smote ten thousands of the children of Se'ir*), but not to murder disarmed captives in a barbaric way.

If this interpretation is right, the quotation in 4.A., *but there is no rest*, functions as a kind of proof-text for this argument: even after victory, even when God laughs with them, they give him no rest from their evil ways. But at the same time this quotation serves as a starting-point for another comment: if there is no rest for God, neither is there rest for his people: they shall go into exile. In Prov. 29:9 it is not stated, for whom *there is no rest* — for the wise man or for the foolish man? For neither of them, is the conclusion of the midrash.

Because of this double function of the quotation in 4.A. it is impossible to demonstrate the structure satisfactorily in a schematic representation of the text. In fact this is often the case, within the body of the *petiḥta* (or any



other midrashic composition), and even with its formal conclusion. In the first *petiḥta* it was easy to separate the transition-line with Lam. 1:1 from the preceding comment; in its parallel in Pesiqta deRav Kahana 13.1, where it serves as a *petiḥta* for Jer. 1:1, ending with 7.C., this 7.C. should be considered as the transition-line with the base verse, but at the same time it is the proof-text for the preceding comment. Moreover, the analysis of the text and the outlining of its structure is closely related to the interpretation; they are interdependent. Trying to establish the structure is useful in an attempt to find the true meaning of the text; but reading a badly structured text with wrong indications hampers the comprehension of its content and its purpose.

One thing may bother us in my analysis of the second example: there is no counterpart for 2 Chr. 25:12 as a comment on *there is no rest* to be found in the first subsection (2.E.). Is this due to the transmission of the text? Maybe the new edition will have some surprise in store for us? Or is it a flaw of the original composition? A parallel text in Sanhedrin 103a, from R. Yoḥanan, has the two parts worked out more equally, with God being angry with Ahaz, and 2 Chr. 28:23 demonstrating that it did no help, and God laughing with Amaziah, and 2 Chr. 25:14 instead of vs. 12. Perhaps R. Ḥanina b. Papa knew the content of this midrash, but did not remember R. Yoḥanan's proof-texts; the one he took for the first subsection did not provide an apt sequel to demonstrate that *there was no rest*. A similar case of an unsuitable choice to supply a failing memory is described in A. Shinan, "LeTorat haPetiḥta", *Mehqerey Yerushalayim leSifrut Ivrit* 1 (1981), pp. 135-142. But such an assumption would certainly do wrong to R. Ḥanina b. Papa, an outstanding scholar and midrashist; we should rather look for another account. Though the identification of the wise and the fool in R. Yoḥanan's formulation of this tradition (itself attributed to R. Shimon b. Yoḥai) are not expressly stated in Sanhedrin 103a, it is clear that he identified the fool with individuals, Ahaz and Amaziah; and God's anger at Ahaz is described on the basis of 2 Chr. 28:5. R. Ḥanina b. Papa, on the other hand, preferred to identify the fool with Israel, for obvious homiletical reasons, and therefore he had to change 2 Chr. 28:5 to vs. 6, and 2 Chr. 25:14 to vs. 12. Consequently he accepted that there was no alternative for 2 Chr. 28:23, to serve as the proof-text for a collective sin after God's anger; and this part of the structure had to be left blank.

Anyhow, to start a new section by repeating 2.F. as the heading of an independent series of comments (3.A.-E.) is utterly wrong, and it demonstrates an erroneous reading of the text. In his commentary on this *petiḥta* Neusner writes: "Once again it appears that an available exegesis of Chronicles has been introduced, essentially for capricious reasons, into what should be a smooth exposition of No. 2 fulfilled at Nos. 4, then, naturally, 5. In all, this is a very odd way of doing things." In all, it is too clear that Neusner did not understand this admirable piece of midrash.

Two examples were taken at random; that will suffice. One more private objection may be raised: I loathed the lay-out of the text, its many printing errors and inconsistencies, faulty references of quotations, etc. I was startled reading a line that consists of the symbols ]. only!

Neusner claims in his Introduction "to provide a useful system of identifying each sentence of each paragraph of each chapter of each document, something that, for Scripture, we have had for many centuries." Should we really refer to the end of *petihta* 24 with the indication XXIV.ii.3.PPP.? It is much easier to refine the existing reference system by indicating the number of page and line of the current Hebrew editions (or even translations), if a reference by chapter and paragraph is not precise enough. Surely Neusner's system will not be used in the new edition of Shir haShirim Rabbah, in preparation by M.C. Steller-Kalff and the author of this review — it would hurt our feelings about typographical aesthetics. But certainly Neusner needs less time to "re-translate" the entire midrashic literature, providing it with numerals and letters, than others to prepare an edition of a single collection.

Hans-Ernst Steller

A. Niccacci, *Lettura sintattica della prosa ebraico-biblica. Principi e applicazioni* [Studium Biblicum Franciscanum. Analecta n. 31] (Franciscan Printing Press: Jerusalem, 1991). Pp. xii + 264. Price: US \$ 15.

The author will be known to many readers for his *Sintassi del verbo ebraico nella prosa biblica classica* (Jerusalem, 1986) and its expanded English version *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* (tr. W.G.E. Watson [Sheffield, 1990] as well as a few articles on the same subject published in the meanwhile. The present reviewer published a fairly extensive assessment of *Sintassi* in this annual: vol. 27 (1989) 187-93. The new work consists of two parts: an exposition of the basic principles which the author claims are at work in the tense system of Biblical Hebrew prose (pp. 1-41), and their application to a selection of extended Old Testament prose passages, specifically Joshua 1-6, Judges 1-8, and 2 Samuel 5-7 with their parallels in 1 Chronicles (pp. 43-245). The basic principles expounded here remain little changed, and the reviewer stands by his earlier assessment of *Sintassi* in its general outline. One then asks how effectively the author's principles are shown to be applicable to the chosen biblical passages.

When one is told that the syntactical principles really necessary for analysis of biblical Hebrew texts can be reduced to a few (p. v), one may react with either joy or alarm. In fact, they are mere two in number: the position of the finite verb (first slot or second slot in a clause) and the linguistic level of the text (primary or secondary). In reality, however, the

picture is a little more complex, as the reader sees from many tables presented conveniently and lucidly in Part 1 of the monograph, which proceeds with hardly a single actual example quoted, making for somewhat hard reading.

As regards Part 2, each chosen pericope is presented chapter by chapter, first the Hebrew text in full, followed then by a detailed syntactical commentary on most of the verses of the chapter and concluding with a paragraph entitled 'macrosintassi.' The Hebrew text is presented with a useful device of indentation, which clearly lays bare the linguistic levels inherent in the text. One is reminded of Neusner's method of presenting rabbinic texts in English translation. The section "Commento sintattico" helps to see how the principles work and how issues arising from their application may be handled.

The following desultory observations, all on Joshua, are partly intended to show some of the reservations which are still with me in regard to the approach advocated by Niccacci.

i 1. The very first word of the book, *wayhi*, seems to fly in N.'s fundamental thesis. As a way-out N. sees in it a redactional device establishing a larger link between the book of Joshua and that of Deuteronomy, and he quotes Jdg i 1 and Ru i 1 as two more such examples. But how about Esth i 1? Which biblical book is it supposed to follow? See a brief discussion in P. Joüon — T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Rome, 1991), § 118 c and n. 2 there.

i 2, on *mōše 'avdi mēt*. An example quoted in *Sintassi* § 23 supposed to represent the same type, "resoconto," displays the reverse word-order: *qāšar ḡimri*. Furthermore, is *mēt* nothing but a perfect?

i 4 N. analyses the whole verse as a complex nominal clause. The second constituent is *yiyhe*. It seems to me that *hāyā*, when "copulaic," is to be treated differently from all other verbs. Its function is simply to overlay a temporal/modal feature on to the underlying plain nominal clause.

i 5 One likes to know how N. would syntactically analyse the opening clause: *lō' yityaššēv 'iš*.

ii 5. According to N., *wayhi hašša'ar lišgōr* indicates the circumstance "la porta stava per essere chiusa," presenting a break in the flow of narration. We would rather see it as direct continuation of the preceding *bā'u 'ēlai hā'ānāšim*: "and then came the time for closing the city gates." Moreover, the immediately following clause is best understood as a circumstantial clause; instead of N.'s "Quando poi la porta stava per essere chiusa per le tenebre, quegli uomini sono usciti," one would rather translate "..., by which time the men had left."

ii 6 *whi' he'ēlātam 'al haggāgā*, the function of which is not "richiamare un'informazione già nota per precisarla," but it is another circumstantial clause: contrary to the fib she was telling, "she had actually taken them up

to the roof." The important notion of circumstantial clause is virtually absent from N.'s scheme.

ii 7. Certainly not a continuation of "la linea secondaria del versetto precedente (antefatto)," but rather, together with vs. 8, provides a background to vs. 9. The use of the syntagma *Wa + Impf.* would have been contrary to the flow of the narrative. Rather, all the four clauses in these two verses are circumstantial clauses. Note also that, contrary to N.'s general thesis, there is no focus or emphasis whatsoever in *hā'ānāš* or *bašša'ar* occupying the first slot in what he would classify as complex nominal clauses.

iii 14b. This is no apodosis, but a circumstantial clause. The translation, therefore, should not begin with "quando."

iii 15. Here it is not the case that we have three protases of equal standing, but rather the third clause is circumstantial and its *mālē* is not a perfect, but rather adjective. The clause can thus be further indented.

iii 16. The clause *qāmu ... šārtān* is not on a par ("equivalenti") with the other two in the verse, but is subordinate to the preceding, being explanatory of it.

iii 17. The middle clause with *ōvrim* is again circumstantial, and the transition from the wayyiqtol in the preceding clause to the simple nominal clause is not meant to indicate a distinction between the priests who remained standing and the people who crossed the river.

iv 2-3. Here again another layer or depth is to be recognised, which can be shown as follows:

imperative ————— w-imperative  
 imperative ————— w-qatal

All in all we have here a very readable and instructive study.

T. MURAOKA

Walter Selb, *Sententiae Syriacae. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, deutsch übersetzt, mit einem syrischen und griechischen Glossar versehen und kommentiert*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 567. Band (Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für antike Rechtsgeschichte, Nr. 7), Wien 1990.

Apart from fragments of the Syro-Roman Law Book, the Syriac manuscript Vat. Syr. 560 (8th/9th c.) contains, on one folio (f. 27r-v), the remnants of a separate juridical work. W. Selb published these remnants as early as 1968 ("Sententiae Syriacae", in *Zeitschr. der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung*, 85, 1968, 400-403). The same work, in a complete version this time, later turned up among the mss. of the

This work, published for the first time by A. Vööbus, has now convincingly been shown by W. Selb to constitute an independent juridical work, distinct from the Syro-Roman Law Book and containing purely Roman law. Within the development of Roman law it mainly represents an early post-classical phase which should be assigned to the period of Diocletian. One hundred and two short paragraphs deal with law for individuals (slavery, tutelage, abandonment of a child), family law (betrothal, marriage, children), right of property and acquisition, law of contracts and debts, law of inheritance, law suit, criminal law, *munera publica* and *honores*. Short cases are presented and there seems to be no systematic arrangement underlying the whole collection of "Sententiae".

– Nr. 8 (p. 36): *hw'* should be written without a dot above the *waw* and is to be read in connection with the negative particle (*lā hwā*), cf. T. Nöldeke, *Kurzgefasste Syrische Grammatik*, 2nd ed., par. 328B).

– The Syriac text of nr. 17 (p. 38) is lacking in the copy which is reviewed here! Fortunately this paragraph can be supplemented from the photograph of ms. Vat. Syr. 560 on the front cover of the book. It reads as follows:

The translation “bei wem von ihnen, dem Vater oder der Mutter ...” is grammatically incorrect. I would suggest:

"When the marriage of a man and a woman is dissolved, the judge should examine which of these (possibilities has to be chosen): is it fitting for the child to live and to be nourished either at his father's or his mother's (place)?"

– Nr. 24 (p. 42-43) should be translated: "The son is not allowed to pawn (or: to donate) the (things) of the mother as long as she lives" (*mšakkānu*, cf. p. 81).

– Nr. 29 (pp. 42-43): *'a(y)k haw d-* may rather have a hypothetic meaning "as if he had falsified documents" (cf. Nöldeke, *op. cit.*, par. 364).

– Nr. 46 (pp. 48-49): *'akman d-(')itēh z'ortā wa-d-lā sāpqā* may again render a participial phrase with ὥς (cf. sub nr. 9); one may translate "(he is not allowed to refuse it, arguing) that it would be (too) small and insufficient".

The text and translation are followed by a glossary of Syriac words (pp. 69-83) and by a list of the Greek terms (some of them of Latin origin) that occur in Syriac transliteration (p. 85). In the most extensive chapter, "Kommentar zu den einzelnen Stellen" (pp. 87-188), the content of each of the passages is studied in depth and references are given to parallel passages in Latin and Greek juridical collections as well as to the Syro-Roman Law Book.

The main lines of this comparative study are summarized in the final chapter, "Die Sententiae Syriacae als Werk" (pp. 189-212). It appears that 31 paragraphs are to be identified as imperial rescripts from the years 293-294 A.D. The editor further points to some model collections ("Vorlage-sammlungen") that may have served as sources for the author of the *Sententiae*. The latter in all probability drew *ex corpore Gregoriani*, *ex corpore Hermogeniani*, *ex corpore Theodosiani* and *ex Pauli sententiarum libris*. On the basis of these data the origin of the collection may be dated between 472 and 529 A.D. (pp. 195-196).

When compared with their (mainly) Latin counterparts, the Syriac *Sententiae* often present slightly abridged versions or paraphrases, which maintain, however, in a very precise form the main lines of the original content. A well-educated lawyer must, therefore, have been responsible for the present collection, which may perhaps be connected with the School of Berytos. Accordingly, one may think of a Greek rather than of a Latin original, which was subsequently — at an unknown date and place — translated into Syriac (p. 202).

As to the question how to explain the existence of this new juridical collection in Syriac, the editor is inclined to suppose that "purely literary purposes" were involved (p. 211). Whether this holds true for its introduction in one branch of the West Syrian Synodicon as well is questionable. The transmission of Greek and Roman juridical texts in Syriac still needs to be studied in a broader context. For such a study, relevant for both law historians and Syriac scholars, Professor Selb has laid solid foundations, with this new book as well as with his other works. Being grateful for his

achievements so far, we look forward to further works by him in this highly specialized field.

Lucas Van Rompay

Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. (Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash and Targum, II). (Bar Ilan University Press: Ramat-Gan, 1990). Pp. 823. Price: \$ 99.

Wenn man einen nachreichsaramäischen jüdisch-palästinisch-aramäischen Text übersetzen wollte, empfahl es sich bisher, zunächst einmal G. Dalman: *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*, Frankfurt 1922 aufzuschlagen, weil es den größten Wortschatz bietet. Allerdings weist Dalman nur Stellen aus dem babylonischen Targum nach. Daher war es nötig, wenn man darüber hinaus wissen wollte, ob ein Wort oder eine Bedeutung überhaupt palästinisch ist und nicht etwa nur babylonisch, auf die beiden umfangreichen Wörterbücher von J. Levy zurückzugreifen: *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen großen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums*, Leipzig 1867f. und *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, Leipzig 1876-89, die viele Stellenangaben und oft auch ausführliche Zitate bringen, sich jedoch nur auf die damals zur Verfügung stehenden, für den praktischen Gebrauch bestimmten Drucke stützen. Einen begrenzten jüdisch-palästinisch-aramäischen Wortschatz bieten auch J.T. Marshall: *Manual of the Aramaic Language of the Palestinian Talmud*, Leiden 1929, 203-51 und E.Y. Kutscher, in: F. Rosenthal: *An Aramaic Handbook*, Wiesbaden, 1967, I/2, 52-76; dazu kommen einige neuere Spezialuntersuchungen, besonders von E.Y. Kutscher, S. Lieberman und J. Naveh. Mit dem Erscheinen des hier zu besprechenden Wörterbuches ist man nun mit Einem Schlag allen umständlichen und nicht selten erfolglosen Herumsuchens enthoben. Der Fortschritt gegenüber den früheren Wörterbüchern ist groß:

1. Alle in Palästina vom 3.-12. Jh. n. Chr. verfaßten jüdisch-aramäischen Texte werden erfaßt, also auch die Inschriften, die Papyri aus Ägypten, die Eheverträge aus der Kairoer Genisa, die Amulette und die Zaubertexte, die Piutim, die tiberische Masora und die palästinische Literatur der Gaonen. Das Pentateuchtargum Pseudo-Jonathan (Jeruśalmi I) bleibt wegen seines starken babylonisch-targumischen Einflusses und seiner vielen Fehler auch mit seinem palästinischen Anteil ausgeschlossen, erst recht alle Targume und Targumfragmente zu Josua bis 1.2Chronik. Die Einleitung (3-21) gibt eine nützliche Zusammenstellung aller vorhandenen jüdisch-palästinisch-aramäischen Texte. Allerdings werden dabei die zwar begrenzten, aber auffälligen Dialektunterschiede (vgl. dazu K. Beyer: *The Aramaic Language. Its Distribution and Subdivisions*, Göttingen 1986, 23-25, 38-40) nicht erwähnt, nur auf Abweichungen der Targumsprache wird gelegentlich zu einem

Wort hingewiesen (so etwa 153b.159b). Ein gleichfalls sehr hilfreiches Register aller zitierten Stellen — eine Auswahl hatte auch schon Levy 1889 geboten — beschließt das Wörterbuch (597-820). Personen- und Ortsnamen sind nicht verzeichnet, wohl aber die davon abgeleiteten Zugehörigkeitsadjektive.

2. Bei allen Texten werden die ältesten und besten Handschriften zugrunde gelegt. Das gesamte Material ist neu aus den Texten erhoben. Wo es nötig ist, werden Emendationen vorgeschlagen.

3. Die Bezeugung des jeweiligen Wortes in den anderen aramäischen Sprachen, besonders Palästinas, bis hin zum Neuaramäischen und im Hebräischen wird mitgeteilt.

4. Oft werden ganze Sätze zitiert (wie schon bei Levy), so daß auch die Konstruktion der Wörter und typische Verbindungen deutlich werden. Sie hätten aber noch viel zahlreicher sein sollen.

5. Am Ende der einzelnen Artikel wird in Kleindruck wichtige Sekundärliteratur genannt.

6. Die Lehn- und Fremdwörter und besonders auch die Hebraismen werden identifiziert. Nicht aufgenommen sind nur reine Transkriptionen griechischer Wörter, wie sie sich besonders häufig in einem Papyrus aus Ägypten (»KetPap«) finden.

7. Der Druck ist übersichtlich und sehr gut lesbar.

8. Der Preis ist durch die Herstellung in Israel sehr niedrig.

Einiges ist mir jedoch aufgefallen:

1. Die Wörter sind nicht nach Wurzeln geordnet wie etwa in C. Brockelmann: *Lexicon Syriacum*, Halle 1928 oder in K. Beyer: *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, Göttingen 1984 (im folgenden: *ATTM*), 499-728, sondern alphabetisch wie in den hebräischen Wörterbüchern üblich und auch in C.F. Jean — J. Hoftijzer *DISO*, d.h. das Wörterbuch ist mehr auf den praktischen Gebrauch ausgerichtet als für die hohe Semitistik bestimmt. Verwandte Wörter sind durch Verweise miteinander verbunden, wobei jeweils beim Verbum alle Ableitungen vermerkt sind, so daß man sich immerhin eine Wortfamilie zusammensuchen kann. Sehr verwirrend ist jedoch, daß die Vokalbuchstaben ו = w, י = y bei der alphabetischen Einordnung ohne erkennbares Prinzip mitberücksichtigt werden, ohne daß wenigstens abweichende Schreibungen an ihrem Platz erwähnt werden. Wer also ein bestimmtes Wort sucht, kann leicht den Eindruck gewinnen, daß es im Jüdisch-Palästinisch-Aramäischen gar nicht vorkommt, weil er es an der üblicherweise zu erwartenden Stelle nicht findet. Auch werden bei festen Verbindungen vorangestellte Präpositionen mitberücksichtigt, wodurch Zusammengehöriges noch weiter auseinandergerissen wird. Dafür einige Beispiele:

46b: אָחַז afel »in Besitz nehmen« steht unter אָחַז (ohne Verweis unter אָחַז), weil das auch im Wortinneren des afel oft und des ittaf. immer



beibehaltene א (aber nur in Targum Neofiti!) dafür spräche, daß synchron eine vierradikale Wurzel vorläge. In Wirklichkeit dient das א hier einfach dazu, afel und ittaf. eindeutig zu kennzeichnen, entweder durch etymologisierende Schreibung wie schon im Reichsaramäischen (ATTM 150 unten; 148 Mitte) oder — so spät wahrscheinlicher — durch א = -a- (vgl. 550a, 11).

54a: אִיקַר (א) »Ehre« (yqr) steht unter dem häufiger belegten, aber jüngeren אִיקַר.

83b: כְּבֵהִילוֹ »in Eile« steht unter כב mit Verweis unter כְּהִל itp. »aufschrecken.«

97a: בֵּר (Stat.absol. in Ex 21,31 A) »Sohn« steht unter בִּיר (Stat. absol. in Gen 29f. E; spätes ber: ATTM 535 Mitte), jedoch בִּרָה »Tochter« unter בִּרָה.

105: בֵּין (< bayn) »zwischen« steht unter der ganz seltenen Schreibung בן ohne Verweis unter dem üblichen בֵּין.

116b: בְּתֵר ד (das ד fehlt im Stichwort) »nachdem« steht vor בְּתֵר »hinter, nach«, wobei beide durch das nicht verwandte בְּתֵר »Anteil« getrennt sind; 139 ist דְּבִתְרָה »was ihm folgt« ein eigenes Stichwort, ebenso 277a לְבִתֵּר »nach« und 314a מִן בְּתֵר »nach«; allerdings wird unter בְּתֵר auf alle außer דְּבִתְרָה verwiesen. Ganz entsprechend werden auch die anderen Präpositionen behandelt.

151b fehlt ein Hinweis auf אִדָּם »Blut« (35b), obwohl das gemeinsemitische דָּם sogar mehrfach in Targum, Talmud und Midrasch vorkommt.

153: דִּי(ה) »dieser,« א(ה/דֵּה) »diese« und אִי(ה) »diese« plur. stehen unter דִּן »dieser« ohne Verweis an den anderen Stellen.

162a: אִידָּא, אִידָּא, אִילָּן, אִילָּן »welche?« stehen unter הִידָּן (י = y) »welcher?« ohne Verweis an den anderen Stellen.

166a stehen אָן (ältere Form; 63f. ohne Verweis), הֵן »wo?« und מִן הֵן »woher?«, aber לָהֵן »wohin?« steht 278a, überall mit Verweisen.

169f. sind die mit w- anlautenden Wörter häufiger mit וּ als mit וּ eingeeordnet, obwohl bei den meisten beide Schreibungen vorkommen.

193b lautet das Stichwort חֻוּן »Erscheinung,« obwohl nur חֻוּן belegt ist.

246b: יִשְׁרָאֵל ist, soweit nicht hebräisch, dasselbe yašširā.

397a: עֲדָב »Los« steht unter dem ganz selten belegten עֲדָו.

482a: קֻמַּס comes steht unter dem nur im Syrischen belegten קֻמַּס.

538a + 546a: שִׁדָּה (שִׁדָּה) »Dämon« steht unter שִׁדָּה, שִׁדָּה (שִׁדָּה) »Dämonin« unter שִׁידָּה.

570: שִׁ steht nach שִׁ! Wörter mit \*š, die mindestens Einmal mit שִׁ geschrieben sind, werden unter שִׁ aufgeführt, die übrigen unter שִׁ.

Ein englisch-aramäischer Index hätte das Auffinden solcher Wörter erleichtert und dazu ganz allgemein das Wörterbuch noch besser abgeschlossen.

2. In auffälligem Gegensatz zum Grundsatz dieses Wörterbuches, jeweils die ältesten und besten Handschriften zugrunde zu legen, wird das Penta-

teuchtargum meist nach dem späten und zweifelhaften Kodex Neophyti (1504 n. Chr.) zitiert, oft sogar an Stellen, die auch in den viel älteren und besseren Fragmenten aus der Kairoer Genisa (8.-14. Jh. n. Chr.) erhalten sind. Offensichtlich hatte M. Sokoloff die Bearbeitung der Targume schon abgeschlossen, als die vorzügliche, vollständig mit Photographien versehene Edition von M.L. Klein: *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*, Cincinnati 1986 erschien (+ Weiteres aus D und E: *Sefarad* 49, 1989, 123-33). So trug er nur noch das Wichtigste daraus nach (181b, 12 u. ö. sogar einfach nur mit »ib.« an die Neophytistelle angehängt, womit die Chronologie und die Bedeutung auf den Kopf gestellt ist). Da auch das Glossar von M.L. Klein in Bd. II 99-131 nur eine Auswahl der Stellen bietet, ist eine Konkordanz der Targumfragmente aus der Kairoer Genisa ein dringendes Desiderat. Übrigens wäre bei den Stellenangaben die Abkürzung FPT für *Fragments of the Palestinian Targum*, die ohnehin leicht mit FTP für *Fragment Targums ms. Paris* verwechselt werden kann, entbehrlich gewesen, da immer noch die Ziffer der Handschrift in eckigen Klammern beigefügt ist.

3. Das Geschlecht der Wörter ist, soweit bekannt, angegeben. Allerdings werden die Stellen, die es erkennen lassen, nicht ausdrücklich beigefügt. Doch finden sie sich wenigstens teilweise unter den angeführten Zitaten. Das Geschlecht ist falsch angegeben bei ערש »Bett« (420a) fem. (EchR 47:26 {א} ערש!), es fehlt bei שכן »Lid« (550b) mask.

4. Die meisten der zugrundegelegten Handschriften sind nach 1100 n. Chr. geschrieben, so daß mit babylonischen Wörtern und Formen gerechnet werden muß. Mehrere sind schon dingfest gemacht, so רבש »Honig« mit  $\phi$  (139a), יטב afel »gut machen« mit  $aw/\bar{\phi}$  (239b; ATTM 589), ינק afel »säugen« mit  $aw/\bar{\phi}$  (242b; ATTM 598), מטי afel »bringen« (?) (302b; ATTM 622) und נקבה »weiblich« mit  $\phi$  (360a; ATTM 641), aber ihre Zahl läßt sich noch vermehren: אדן »Ohr« mit  $\phi$  (36; ATTM 505), 'okkām »schwarz« (39a; ATTM 510), אסקופתה »Schwelle« mit ק (52b; ATTM 646), בחר »hinter, nach« mit Pluralsuffixen (fast nur im Targum Neophyti, aus dem babylonischen Targum; 116b; ATTM 526), טל »Schatten« mit  $\phi$  (224b; ATTM 590), טפר »Kralle« mit  $\phi$  (230a; ATTM 591), מטול »wegen« (301b; ATTM 590; christlich-palästinisch < syrisch: C. Müller-Kessler, *Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinisch-Aramäischen*, Hildesheim 1991, 149), עדי pa"el »schwanger werden« (396b; ATTM 652) und עידוי »Schwangerschaft« (402b), עור itp. mit  $\bar{a}$  »erwachen« (400b; ATTM 655), ענוותן »niedrig« und ענוותנו »Niedrigkeit« (412; ATTM 662), das Zugehörigkeitsadjektiv sing.emph.mask. und absol.fem. auf אה  $\bar{a}\bar{'}\bar{a}$ , wie in עילאה »obere« (404b; ATTM 454 oben). Das Targumfragment Ex 40 [4] ed. M.L. Klein I 302-305 stammt aus dem babylonischen Targum und wurde von M.L. Klein versehentlich an das palästinische Fragment Ex 39 D angefügt. Die 606 d. 607a vollständig aufgezählten 23 Zitate sind daher zu tilgen.

5. Folgende Wörter und Formen fehlen:

**בני** »bauen« (106a; *ATTM* 533) **pa<sup>el</sup>** (Gen 2,22 B »ausbauen«) und **itpa.** (Gen 30,3 E »Kinder haben«).

Die Pronomina **דין** »dieser« (Engedi: *ATTM* 550), **דא** »diese« (Gen 4,10 B), **אידא** »welche?« (Gen 31,39 C), **אלין** »diese« (diese älteste Schreibung des selbständigen Demonstrativpronomens ist 153 gar nicht erwähnt: Gen 9,18 E; 32,20 C) als Korrelativa vor dem Relativpronomen (153.162a; vgl. 144a,-3).

**חורי** *ḥewwārāy* »weiß« (**חורייין**: Gen 30,37 E; *ATTM* 575).

**חליין** *ḥalyin* »Schmuck« (KetPap 22; < hebräisch).

**חללין** *ḥellin* »Tücher« (KetPap 22).

**כמסת דלא** »damit nicht« (Gen 39,10 E).

**סני** (367b) **pa<sup>el</sup>** »vermehrten« (**קסני**: Gen 48,4 D).

**סני**<sup>2</sup> »gehen« (palästinischer Talmud; < babylonisch?).

**לעסק** »als« (KetPap 21; vgl. 413f.).

**קדושה** »Heiligkeit« (Papyrus aus Ägypten Berlin P. 8497,10).

6. Druckfehler habe ich nur selten gefunden: 14 bzw. 17 fehlen die Abkürzungen *MWA* und *TA* (beide z.B. 58a); 46b,23 (richtig: **אַתְחַסְנוּ** *FPT*); 48b,-4 (richtig: **אִי(י)ל(י)** ohne das **אי**); 72b,2 (die Punktation von *TN* zu *FPT*!); 97a,8 (richtig: *FPT* Ex 21,31 [01]); 98a,-3 (**גו** statt **גוי**); 118a,16 (fehlt der Verweis auf **לגבי**, **לגבי** 277a); 162b,-1 (**הך** statt des häufigeren, aber bei der Einordnung hier nicht berücksichtigten **היך**, die 163f. für jede ihrer drei Bedeutungen einen eigenen Artikel erhalten haben!); 184a,-8 (richtig: **חבט**); 196a,8 (richtig: *FPT* ib. [02]); 284a,9 (richtig: Mat 27: 46); 288a,6 (in *FPT* Gen 32:15 [03] steht beide Male **מאון**, jedoch mit verschiedener Punktation); 329b,18f. (richtig: pl.c. **מארי** *FPT* Gen 46:32 [04]; s.c. **מרה** Pap 7:3; **מרא** *FPT* Dt 32:36 [26]); 367b,-13 (richtig: **לעלם**); 372b,-8 (richtig: **αὐτός**); 375a,-6 (richtig: **ἡμεῖς**); 404b,-15 (richtig: pl.abs. **עלאין** *FPT* Dt 26:19 [04]); 526b,18 (richtig: **רמשא** *FPT*); 549b,-5 (itpe. statt itpa.); 584a,10 (Pe. statt Pa.); 598c (Rehov 1,25 statt 2,25 wie richtig 426a,-1).

7. Schließlich sind zu einer Reihe von Wörtern und Formen noch Bemerkungen nötig:

31a: Der St.constr. von **ʾab** »Vater« lautet **ʾāb** (babylonisch- targumisch, nabatäisch; **אבי** ist hebräisch); **ʾa/ēbbā** ist Zärtlichkeitsform (zu *-bb-* vgl. *ATTM* 445) in der Bedeutung »mein/unser Vater« (Gen D) und hat im Babylonisch-Targumischen den St.emph. verdrängt.

46b: Wie *FPT* D.E zeigen, sind St.absol. **ʾaḥsānā**, constr. **ʾaḥsānūt** dasselbe Wort »Erbe«; **ʾaḥsānāt** usw. ist galiläisch.

53b,12: **אפשר** ist in Gen 4,14 B punktiert, warum nicht auch hier?

64a,22: **ben** > **ʿen** »wenn« hat ein kurzes *e*.

67b,8: **אסי** »heilen« kommt auch im qal vor: Ex 21,19 A **אסא** »er heilte«; Amulett 3,22 **אסין** »heilende«.

72: Heißt **אצו** auch im Plural immer »Teig« und gegen den hebräischen Text niemals »Backtrog«?

101b,-6: In dem Ehrentitel *bərrabbī* > *bērebbī* steckt doch wohl das hebräische *bən* und nicht das späte aramäische *bēr* (ATTM 537).

153b,12: Die targumischen Demonstrativa stehen in einigen festen Verbindungen vor den Substantiva (Gen 38,25 E; Num 28,21.24.29 F).

163a,-10: Auch in den unter 2) genannten Sätzen ist **אִינוֹן** Subjekt.

172b: **זִיחורִי** (Gen 38,28.30 E; Num 19,6 AA) > **זִיחורי** (Ex 39,24.29 D) stehen ausgerechnet unter der wohl dem babylonischen Targum entnommenen Schreibung **זחורי** »rote Farbe.«

292f.: **מה** in direkter Frage und **מה** in indirekter Frage und als Korrelativ sind ohne Grund auf drei verschiedene Artikel verteilt.

312b + 316b: **מֶן** »wer?« als Korrelativ und als Fragewort sind durch 3 1/2 Seiten **מֶן** »aus« (und Verbindungen damit) voneinander getrennt!

390a.b: **סתר** »verbergen« ist judäisch (Engedi), aber nicht galiläisch.

485a: **קצו** »Keule« ist auch in Qumran belegt (ATTM 682).

513b,-9: Zu *rāḥē* »Knabe« lautet das Fem. *rāḥyā* (ATTM 691).

526b: **רמש** »Abend« ist ostaramäisch *qatl*, westaramäisch *qutl*.

550a Mitte: Im galiläischen itp. **אשכח** »gefunden werden« wurde durch totale progressive Assimilation -*štk-* > -*ššk-* (Z. Ben-Hayyim) ähnlich wie im gesamten Aramäisch -*sl-* > -*ss-* in *ʾasseq* »heraufbringen.«

554b: **שלם** afel »vollendet, voll sein« ist ja wohl in Wirklichkeit ein qal mit prostheticum.

558a,16: Das **ו** im Inf. **משמוע** »hören« stammt aus dem hebräischen Inf.absol. von Ex 19,5.

588a: **תפלין**, **תפלה** »Amulett« hat mit hebräisch »Gebet« nichts zu tun (ATTM 431 unten)!

Warum wird gegen die Fastenrolle und die Synagogeninschrift von Engedi der Tischri (September/Oktobre) als erster Monat gezählt?

Warum werden die Wurzeln III $\bar{t}$  als Stichwort richtig am Ende mit **י** geschrieben, aber falsch die christlich-palästinische Entsprechung mit **א** und die samaritanische mit **ה** (106a oben u.ö.)?

Sollten **גלי** »enthüllen« und »auswandern« (129b) und **שוי** »gleich sein« und **paʿel** »legen« (540a) nicht jeweils als zwei verschiedene Wurzeln angesetzt werden?

Es sollten keine Targumstellen zitiert werden, wo im Hebräischen und im Targum dasselbe Wort an derselben Stelle steht (z.B. 398b,3 in Gen 29,33 E **עוד**).

Die häufige Endung der Zugehörigkeitsadjektive plur.emph.mask. **אֵי-אַ**, wie immer in **יהודאי** »die Juden,« ist nicht galiläisch (ATTM 39).

Jetzt müssen noch die palästinischen Bestandteile des Pentateuchtargums Jeruśalmi I und aller nichtbabylonischer Targume zu Josua bis 1.2Chronik erfaßt werden. Es gibt zwar schon eine Konkordanz zu Jeruśalmi I von

E.G. Clarke 1984 und zu Esther von B. Grossfeld 1984, aber davon abgesehen muß man weiter das Targumwörterbuch von J. Levy 1867f. zu Rate ziehen. Doch können schon jetzt viele Formen aus der *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch* von G. Dalman mit der Hilfe von M. Sokoloffs Wörterbuch nachgeprüft werden. Noch vor diesem Wörterbuch hätte eine kritische Sammlung aller galiläischen Texte aus Talmud und Midrasch veröffentlicht werden sollen (M. Sokoloff hatte sich ja sicher vorweg so etwas angelegt), die man dann immer hätte zitieren können. Sie ist auch weiterhin dringend erwünscht. Da viele Partien mehrfach überliefert sind, dürfte eine solche Edition nicht übermäßig umfangreich werden, auch wenn bei größeren Abweichungen Parallelen in Spalten nebeneinander gedruckt werden müßten.

Die Ausführlichkeit dieser Besprechung soll die große Bedeutung dieses neuen Wörterbuches für die Aramaistik und besonders für das Aramäische Palästinas hervorheben. Wenn auch noch die angekündigten Wörterbücher zum Samaritanischen von Z. Ben-Ḥayyim und A. Tal, zum Christlich-Palästinischen von C. Müller-Kessler und zum Neuwestaramäischen von W. Arnold erschienen sein werden, wird sich die palästinisch-aramäische Lexikographie in kurzer Zeit von einem Stiefkind zu einem Musterknaben der Semististik entwickelt haben.

Abgeschlossen 10.12.1991

K. Beyer